DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 137 UD 013 161

AUTHOR	Wasson, Robert M.; And Others
TITLE	An Evaluation of Operation Return. New York City Title I Project.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	1 Nov 69
NOTE	160p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Problems; Compensatory Education Programs; Discipline Policy; Family Involvement; Family School Relationship; Federal Programs; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Mathematics; Remedial Reading; *Student Behavior; *Student Rehabilitation; Student School Relationship; *Suspension
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I Programs; *New York City

ABSTRACT

Under a Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act grant, the New York City Board of Education instituted a pilot project entitled Operation Return, the purpose of which was to provide some form of continuing instruction for pupils who had been suspended from other Board of Education educational opportunities. The major emphasis of the program was to return suspended pupils as soon as possible within a ten-day period to the regular school instruction. The stated objectives of the program were as follows: (1) to provide continuing instruction of a special nature with the hope of improving skills in reading, mathematics, and social living, as well as in other subject matter areas; (2) to work with the family of each student in order to create a partnership of involved concern; and, (3) to manifest such interest in each student that a return to school with the hope of success is possible on a part-time or full-time basis. The evaluation design had two principal components: (1) a description of the project's implementation in each of the instructional settings in terms of the objectives specified above; and (2) determination of the effectiveness of the project in the attainment of those objectives outlined both generally and specifically in the project proposal. A total of six districts participated in Operation Return during the 1968-1969 academic year. (Author/JM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 072137

An Evaluation Of Operation Return

New York City Title I Project

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1968-69 school year.

Project Director
Professor Robert Wasson

The Center for Field Research and School Services
School of Education
New York University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 013161

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses

51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

November 1, 1969

Dr. J. Wayne Wrightstone
Assistant Superintendent
BOARD OF EDUCATION
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Dear Dr. Wrightstone:

In fulfillment of the agreement dated January 29, 1969 between the New York City Public Schools and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit six hundred copies of the report for the Evaluation of the Operation Return Program in the New York City Schools.

The Bureau of Research and the professional staff of the New York City Public Schools were most cooperative in providing data and facilitating the study in general. Although the objective of the team was to evaluate a project funded under Title I, this report goes beyond this goal. Explicit in this report are recommendations for modifications and improvement of the program. Consequently, this report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with education in New York City -- the Board of Education, professional staff, students, parents, lay leaders, and other citizens. To this end, the study team is prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of its report. In addition, the study team looks forward to our continued affiliation with the New York City Public Schools.

You may be sure that New York University and its School of Education will maintain a continuing interest in the Schools of New York City.

Respectfully submitted,

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:n

cc: Dean Daniel E. Griffiths

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The director of this evaluation project would like to thank the following individuals whose assistance made this report possible. Dr. Bernard Katz, Dr. Richard Ellis, and Stephen Weiss of the N.Y.U. School of Education and graduate assistants, Barbara Blitz, Cheryl Foti, Robert Hurley, Lynn Pammenter, Fred Rickard, and Leslie Tumin who worked carefully and thoughtfully in the plans and data collection for this report.

The courtesy and assistance of all members of the Operation Return teams are also gratefully acknowledged.

Mr. Stephen Weiss also contributed heavily to the writing of this final report while at the same time experiencing some severe family problems. Phyliss Anderson carefully typed the drafts of this study on demand which involved many very late evenings on her part.

The strengths of this report we share. The weaknesses are mine alone.

R.M.W.

Table of Contents

	Page
List of Tables	i
Introduction	1
Objectives	1
Evaluation Design	2
Description of the Proposed Program	4
Procedures in the Collection and Analysis of Data	8
Analysis of Teacher Interview Form	9
Analysis of Educational Assistant Interview Form	36
Analysis of Family Assistant Interview Form	43
Analysis of Program Assessment and Classroom Observation Form	47
Analysis of Operation Return Coordinator Interview Form	72
Analysis of Pupil Opinionnaire	76
Analysis of Pupil Placement Following Operation Return Placement During the 1968-69 School Year	79
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	82
Appendix A Teacher Interview Form	90
Appendix B Educational Assistant Interview Form	91
Appendix C Family Assistant Interview Form	92
Appendix D Program Assessment and Classroom Observation Form	93
Appendix E Operation Return Coordinator Interview Form	94
Appendix F Pupil Opinionnaire	95

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Program Description by District	6
2	Teaching Experience	13
3	Has Adequate Preparation for Teaching in Operation Return	13
4	Plans for Further Study in Education for the Emotionally Disturbed	14
5	Teacher Ranking of Responsibilities	17
6	Teacher Prediction of Pupil Adjustment	18
7	Settings and Classes by District	49
8	Observers' Rating of Physical Structures	50
9	Suitability of Room Arrangement	52
10	Flexibility of Adaptation	52
11	Effectiveness of Educational Assistant	53
12	Materials Used or Present in Classrooms	56
13	Academic Aspects of the Program	59
14	Creative Aspects of the Program	60
15	Recreational Aspects of the Program	60
16	Effectiveness in Promoting Intellectual Development of Children	61
17	Degree to Which Teacher Effects Stimulation of Positive Human Relationships	64
18	Degree to Which Teacher Helps Children to Understand Their Own Motivation and Those of Other People	64
19	Degree to Which Teacher Promotes Children's Self-Esteem	65
20	Degree to Which Teacher Helps Children to Channel Feeling in Appropriate Ways	65
21	Effectiveness of Teacher in Promoting Social-Emotional Growth of Children	66
22	Focus of the Operation Return Program	67
23	Extent of Cooperative Work Among Operation Return Staff	69
24	Methods of Reinforcement for Socially Desirable Behavior	70
25	Methods of Reinforcement to Facilitate Extinction of Socially Undesirable Behavior	71
26	Pupil Opinionnaire	77
27	Pupil Enrollment and Placements for Operation Return, 1968-1969	80

INTRODUCTION

In any large school district, there exists a substantial number of pupils whose behavior makes maintaining them within regular classes, or indeed, in any formalized instructional setting, extremely difficult. In the past in New York City, some pupils who have not been able to function within the normal public school framework have been suspended for periods of time ranging from a week to many months. The trauma of suspension, emotional, psychological, and social, generated additional problems beyond those experienced by the pupil at the time of his suspension.

In effect, such pupils were "on the streets." During this period of time, and, in spite of the fact that many, if not all of these pupils, have severe educational and emotional difficulties, they were deprived of the type of structure that may be necessary to enable them to function more adequately, both in the public schools and in the larger community as well. Under a Title I grant, the New York City Board of Education instituted a pilot project entitled Operation Return. The purpose of this project was to provide some form of continuing instruction for pupils who had been suspended from other Board of Education educational opportunities. It was further specified in the project proposal, that the major emphasis of the program was to return suspended pupils as soon as possible within a ten-day period to the regular school instruction.

The project began on April 22, 1968 and was implemented in 5 districts: 1, 19, 21, 27, and 28. The program was funded for a second year of operation and District 5 was added to the above. Thus, a total of 6 districts participated in Operation Return during the 1968-1969 academic year. This final report includes a description of the project's implementation during the second year of operation as well as an estimate of the project's effectiveness.

Objectives

The stated objectives of the proposal program as outlined in the project proposal were as follows: (1) To provide continuing instruction of a special nature

with the hope of improving skills in reading, mathematics, and social living, as well as in other subject matter areas; (2) to work with the family of each student in order to create a partnership of involved concern; and (3) to manifest such interest in each student that a return to school with the hope of success is possible on a part-time or full-time basis.

Evaluation Objectives

In addition to the objectives described above, the project proposal specified the following evaluational objectives:

Objective 1. Describe the program and to what extent the project has been implemented.

Objective 2. Determine level of attendance.

Objective 3. Determine the effectiveness of teacher performance toward meeting the needs of Operation Return pupils.

Objective 4. Determine the sufficiency, scope and appropriateness of instructional materials used in Operation Return classes.

Objective 5. Determine the extent of pupil growth in social living and adjustment.

Objective 6. Determine the role of supportive services for the program.

Objective 7. To determine pupil achievement in reading and mathematics.

Objective 8. To survey the views of participating staff in the overall evaluation of the program.

In addition to those objectives, the Evaluation team added the following:

Objective 9. Assess the impact of the program on pupils attitudes towards the school instructional personnel, peers, and themselves.

Evaluation Design

The evaluation of Operation Return was intended to have two principal components: (1) A description of the project's implementation in each of the instructional settings in terms of the objectives as specified in the proposal, and (2)

determination of the effectiveness of the project in the attainment of those objectives outlined both generally and specifically in the project proposal. Major criterion for effectiveness of Operation Return was established as the successful return to regular attendance by pupils served by Operation Return. A secondary criterion of effectiveness was to be the maintenance of pupils within the Operation Return instructional programs.

The original design for the evaluation of Operation Return called for a within-district and between-district analysis. After the Research team was able to ascertain more fully the implementation of this particular project, it was decided that such an analysis would be inappropriate. The wide variation in selection of teaching staff, the wide variation in the selection of subjects for participation, and the differential plans for return exercised within each district, makes such comparisons unwarranted and perhaps invidious. Therefore, with only one exception, results have been presented in terms of a total project rather than in terms of within and between district analyses.

Specific procedures employed in this evaluation were developed by a research team composed of the director of the evaluation project, a specialist in disadvantaged youth, a specialist in child development and elementary guidance, and a specialist in elementary education with particular competency in the instruction of emotionally disturbed children. In addition a staff of 5 doctoral level research assistants were employed as classroom observers and interviewers. These assistants were trained in observational techniques by the research team.

The research team developed structured interview forms and questionnaires for all personnel connected with the project. In addition the director of the project designed a pupil opinionnaire. Copies of all instruments designed for this evaluation are included in the appendix of this report and are as follows: the Coordinator's Interview Form (C.I.F.), the Teacher Interview Form (T.I.F.), the Family Assistant Interview Form (F.A.I.F.), the Education Assistant Interview Form (E.A.I.F.), the Program Assessment Form (P.A.F.), and the Pupil Opinionnaire (P.O.). Personnel interviewed included the district coordinators of Operation Return, the teachers, the

educational assistants, the family assistants, and the school psychologists, and/or social worker. In addition a sample of opinions from pupils were collected with the instrument designed by the director of the evaluation team.

Description of the Proposed Program

It was proposed that a two-pronged approach be utilized in attempting to remove the learning and behavioral problems experienced by the students selected for participation in Operation Return.

The first approach was to utilize small group instruction for the purpose of assisting students in the acquisition of academic skills. The second approach, in combination with the instructional program, was attempting to provide assistance in acquiring adaptive social skills. These skills were taught both as part of the instructional program and as part of the supportive services as provided to the program. Supportive services were to include individual and family counseling as well as other needed services.

Organization of the Program

Initially 5 districts were designated by the Superintendent of Schools. Each district was to have not more than 4 units per district, each composed of 8 students. Initially the units consisted of one elementary class, two junior high school-level classes, and one high school class. The levels of classes were intended to be flexible and alterations were possible at the discretion of the District Superintendent, depending on the needs of the particular district involved. During the first year of operation, the basic 1:2:1 pattern described above was utilized in the pilot districts. During the 1968-1969 academic year, however, this pattern was changed. Two classes were removed from District 1 and placed in District 5 and the levels of instruction were changed, with no district reporting the 1:2:1 pattern of organization. (See Table 1 on page 6 for a description of program implementation and staffing by district.)

For students the program was to operate from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. with a lunch period during the session. Lunch and snacks were provided during the lunch period, which was to be supervised by auxiliary personnel. For teachers and educational assistants, the session was from 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. This last hour was thought of as an unassigned period, as would normally be provided to teachers in a regular school setting. Supervision of children during lunch by auxiliary personnel provided teachers with a duty-free lunch period, as required by contractual agreement with the United Federation of Teachers. Many teachers, however, were reported to have voluntarily attended lunch with students and the auxiliary personnel. The family worker's schedule was expected to be from 6 to 7 hours a day, but on a more flexible basis to provide visits to students' homes beyond the normal school hours.

Location of Classes

One of the assumptions of the proposal was that suspended pupils may look upon school as an area where frustration and failure may have been experienced. It was therefore decided that some classes would be housed in space provided or rented from community agencies such as boy's clubs, settlement houses, educational extensions of churches and synagogues, and other such settings. In addition other classes were housed in existing school buildings. (See Table 1 on page 6 for settings utilized by Operation Return.)

Personnel

For each unit which was to consist of no more than 8 suspended pupils, the following personnel were to be assigned: licensed teacher – this position involved all of the duties normally assigned to a classroom teacher. In addition the teacher was

Table 1
Program Description by District

District	# Classes	Grade Level	Location	Teacher Aide	Family Asst.	Psych.
1	2	Junior High	Boys' Club	2	1	½
5	2	Junior High	Church	2	1	½
19	4	Elementary 2 Middle (5-8) Junior High	Public School	4	2	0
21	4	2 Elementary Junior High Senior High	Public School Housing Project YMCA	4	2	1
27	4	2 Elementary 2 Junior High	Boys' Club Housing Project	4	2	0 (Soc. Wrkr.)
28	4	2 Elementary 2 Junior High	Public School Storefronts	4	2	0 (Soc. Wrkr.)
Totals:	20			20	10	

expected to be interested in working with suspended pupils. Participation by teachers in this program was to be strictly voluntary. Teachers were selected by a variety of methods from district to district, but in almost every instance involved being interviewed by the Project Coordinator.

Auxiliary personnel – an assistant teacher designated-educational assistant was to be employed to assist in recordkeeping, escorting pupils in and out of the building, supervising lunch period, and performing such services at the discretion of the teacher which were within the scope of experience and background of the educational assistant in support of the educational program.

For each two units to consist of not more than 16 suspended pupils, a family assistant was to be available. The function of the family assistant was to serve as liaison between the school and the parents of the pupils in the program. The family assistant was expected to call for pupils when necessary, to escort pupils to and from school when necessary, and to supply the home with information and service within the limits of their training and experience.

For each four units to consist of not more than 32 suspended pupils within each district, a school psychologist position was provided. It was not possible to secure the services of the five school psychologists the program would require for the 1968-1969 school year. Two districts obtained the use of social workers with varying degrees of satisfaction. One psychologist was shared jointly with two districts, while one district had no person in that position. In the proposal, the psychologist had been expected to coordinate testing, clinical and guidance services for the students in the district to which he was assigned, to study children in the use of psychological techniques, in order to assist pupils in their future growth and development, to participate in the treatment of children referred for psychological consultation, and to serve as a consultant for teachers, parents and other program personnel. It is clear from that job description that the social workers obtained for

these positions would not be able to carry out the designated duties, thereby making assessment of the potential role of this proposed individual extremely difficult. (See Table 1 on page 6 for a Description of the Distribution of Personnel.)

Procedures in the Collection and Analysis of Data

Following the construction of the instruments described above by the Operation Return research team, members of that team conducted interviews with all district coordinators during the month of February, 1969. Information collected during those interviews was utilized to further redefine the instruments to be employed in the remainder of this evaluation study. Following the revision of the instruments, particularly the Program Assessment Form, the evaluation team conducted a full-day training session with the graduate students to be employed to observe each Operation Return class, and to conduct interviews with the remainder of the Operation Return personnel. These interview were conducted during the month of March and April of 1969. All interviews were completed within a three-week period so as to reflect relatively parallel period of time in the life of each of these programs. It was not anticipated, however, that there should be any comparison from class to class with respect to the nature of the activities being engaged in by the instructional staff. The Pupil Opinionnaire was administered in the last week of May, 1969.

As a result of the data collected in the interviews with the Operation Return Coordinators and as reported in the interim evaluation report of Operation Return, submitted on April 1, 1969, the primary focus of this final report was predicted to be more sociological rather than psychological. It is ideographic rather than normative, and describes what is rather than attempting to make comparative statements. While it is recognized by the research team that this is not an adequate evaluation of an experimental project, the organization of the program made it most difficult, if not impossible, to go beyond this. In the absence of access to even

quasi-control groups, adequate pre-testing of pupils assigned to the Operation Return project and the unavailability of student personal files, this final report will take the form of a descriptive analysis. Results will be presented in the following order: data from interviews with teachers, educational assistants, and family assistants; data from the program assessment form and the class room observation form; data from interviews with Operation Return Coordinators; and finally, data from the pupil opinionnaire.

A detailed analysis is presented for both teacher and program evaluation while a more concise presentation is given for educational and family assistants, and the district directors.

Analysis of Teacher Interview Form

The Teacher Interview Form was developed in order to get information on the teachers' perceptions of various aspects of Operation Return. Seven areas were delineated for exploration. These were:

I. Recruitment and Hiring Data
II. Teachers' Educational Background and Prior Work Experience
III. Teachers' Evaluation of Program
IV. Classroom Climate and Controls
V. Relationships with Professional Staff
VI. Supervision and In-Service Training
VII. Teachers' Perception of the Goals of the Project

In each of these areas, teachers were asked to respond to questions put to them in a face-to-face interview by members of the NYU evaluation staff. The teachers' responses were then recorded by the interviewer on the TIF. Copies of the TIF were sent to each teacher prior to his meeting with the interviewer in the attempt to obtain thoughtful and honest responses. The Teacher Interview Form has been included as an Appendix of this report.

Nineteen teachers responded to the TIF. The following results were obtained:

I. Recruitment and Hiring Data

Ten teachers indicated that they had been with the project since its inception in the late Spring of 1968. Two teachers were hired in September of 1968 and three teachers were employed at the end of the teachers' work stoppage. The remaining four teachers had been with Operation Return for less than four months when they were interviewed.

Three main factors influenced most of the teachers to join Operation Return. These were (in order):

1. the challenge of working with emotionally-disturbed children
2. reduced class size
3. the desire to be part of an experimental project.

It should be noted, however, that other factors played decisive roles for some teachers, e.g., the desire to avoid induction into the Armed Services, the fewer hours required of classroom teaching, and the proximity to the teacher's home or second job. One teacher indicated that he had been "out of the district and wanted to return. This was the only job available."

There is no clear direction of the effect of initial motivation for a teacher to join Operation Return and his subsequent success with the project. In fact, one interviewer noted that:

"Regardless of original motivation, (the teacher) seems to have a sincere desire to do a good job for these students. He appears to have had a very positive influence on the unit and to have contributed much to stabilizing a chaotic situation."

The recruitment procedures for teachers in Operation Return was characterized by lack of standardization. Most teachers "heard" about the project, e.g., "I heard about the opening from a friend . . . ", "My mother is a friend of the district coordinator", "I heard about the program from my wife . . . ", "I heard about it accidentally . . . ". In some districts, teachers were recruited in a manner which potentially would yield a larger number of applicants from which to select. A

bulletin was circulated informing principals and teachers of the creation of the project and requesting volunteers for the teaching positions. Interested applicants were then screened by district coordinators and, in some cases, psychologists who would select the teachers for the project. Applicants who were accepted were then informed by mail.

Four teachers felt that recruitment and hiring procedures were not productive in selecting effective teaching staff. Each of the four commented negatively about the interview process. As one teacher said:

"The students who wind up in Operation Return are usually both lacking in basic skills and in emotional stability. A simple interview cannot identify the individual who can remedy both problems."

In general, many teachers felt ambivalent about the teacher selection process. Some thought that while the interview process was an appropriate method, their particular interviewer was inadequate. Others felt that teachers selected for Operation Return should meet certain minimal college training and work-experience prerequisites.

Teachers who chose to respond with suggestions for improving recruitment tended to respond in three categories:

1. screening procedures for new staff should include the members of the present staff in an active capacity
2. applicants should observe several Operation Return class rooms prior to their final decision to join the staff
3. "-incentives" of some form should be used to attract capable people to the project.

Recommendations

While it is recognized that a new project may suffer from organizational problems, especially at its inception, a structure must be developed which adequately provides for a pool of qualified applicants from which to select teaching

staff. Information must be disseminated in such a way to communicate:

1. program goals and philosophy
2. the nature and needs of the population to be served
3. the expectations and requirements for teaching staff

Similarly, screening processes need to be refined so that the most capable teachers can be chosen from those who apply. The interview process will be unproductive unless the traits, characteristics or backgrounds of desirable teachers have been specified and communicated to the interviewer. The interviewer must clearly know what characteristics to look for if he is to identify its presence or absence in an applicant.

II. Teacher's Educational Background and Prior Work Experience

The purpose in exploring this area was to provide information on the characteristics of teachers who had been employed via the hiring and recruitment procedures examined in Section I. Some interesting results were forthcoming:

Of the 19 teachers interviewed only three were women. There is no indication as to whether this was a conscious selector choice determined by theoretical consideration or simply a pragmatic expedient.

The educational backgrounds of the teachers varied. Four had completed their Bachelor's Degrees, ten had taken work beyond the Bachelor's Degree, two had completed the Masters' Degree and three had studied beyond the Masters' Degree. However, seven of the teachers indicated that their academic preparation had not prepared them for their role in Operation Return. Of the twelve who had some course-work, only two indicated that the courses were related to the development of curriculum for the disturbed or disruptive child. Almost invariably, the courses were in the area of guidance, group dynamics, or related mental hygiene areas. It appears, that by training at least, teachers were better prepared by their academic preparation to deal with the social-emotional development of the children than with other curriculum concerns.

Seventeen teachers indicated that they had worked with emotionally disturbed children before joining Operation Return. Only three, however, had been teaching on a regular basis in classrooms with emphasis on emotionally disturbed children, e.g., Junior Guidance, "600 Schools," "C.R.M.D.," etc. Most other teachers had worked in regular classrooms where they taught some "aggressive" children or "problem kids."

Eighteen teachers said that they had some kind of teaching experience prior to Operation Return:

Table 2
Teaching Experience

No. of years	Teachers
0	1
1 or less	5
2 or 3	4
3 or more	9

Types of experiences ranged from teaching in the Peace Corps to holding administrative jobs, e.g., acting assistant to the principal. Most teachers had, at some time in their careers, taught in classroom situations.

The most revealing pattern of responses came from the question "Do you feel that the combination of academic coursework and experience which you have had is adequate to prepare you for teaching in Operation Return?"

Table 3
Has Adequate Preparation
for Teaching in Operation Return

Opinion	Number
Yes	10
No	5
Not sure	4

Almost 50 per cent of the teachers expressed doubts that they were well prepared

to teach in Operation Return. One teacher said, rather forthrightly, "I lack training in the skills and methods for teaching emotionally disturbed children." Another teacher responded that, "The experiences were never matched with adequate supervision." Some teachers felt that their prior experiences as workers in the Department of Welfare or as residents of ghettos were more important than "a bunch of theory courses" and that a "special kind of personality" was as important as experience.

A similar pattern of responses arose in answer to whether the teacher would study further in the field of education for emotionally disturbed children:

Table 4
Plans for Further Study
in Education for the Emotionally Disturbed

Opinion	Number
Yes	9
No	6
Undecided	4

More than 50 per cent of the teachers probably would not pursue further studies in the area. Of those teachers who intended to continue their training, three teachers were preparing for guidance counselor positions, two were becoming psychologists, and one teacher was becoming an administrator.

Specifically notable were the two teachers cited above who felt unprepared to teach emotionally disturbed children. Neither planned to pursue further training.

Recommendations

It appears as if the recruitment and hiring practices for Operation Return was generally successful in employing teachers with experience who perceived themselves to have worked previously in some way with emotionally disturbed children.

Operation Return, however, should be concerned with the self-perceptions of

teachers as to the effect of their preparation for teaching emotionally disturbed children on their actual classroom practices. Similar concern should be raised with the seeming lack of plans to continue education in teaching the kinds of children with whom the teachers are working. While we would not dispute the "natural abilities" of many untrained people to establish rapport and relate well to troubled children and would reinforce the importance of a particular temperament or personality type in this work, the evaluation team must point out the importance of supervision, training, and experience for teachers especially in light of the project's expressed goals.

Operation Return should be concerned with the quality of the prospective teacher's pre-project experience, the quality of project in-service experience and the quality and supervision of the experience so as to develop greater competence in the teacher. Since attitudes of teachers toward coursework and its relevance to the classroom situation appeared quite negative, specific in-service or university courses need to be identified and required of teachers as their need becomes apparent. Most of the teachers had little experiential or coursework background in developing curriculum for emotionally disturbed children or remediating specific learning disabilities. Such a background, in view of the project's expressed objectives, would appear to take priority.

III. Teacher's Evaluation of Program

The purpose of exploration in this area was to obtain data on the teacher's perception of his role in relation to the children's social-emotional problems and academic functioning. Information was gathered on how classroom time was apportioned, supplementary contacts with project staff, instructional materials, and teacher's perceptions of program effects upon the children.

A) In response to questions regarding enrollment and average daily attendance in class, teachers indicated a high degree of variability. Enrollments ranged from three to fourteen. Attendance-Enrollment ratios varied from .50(5 of

10) to 1.00(6 of 6). As a total group, teachers reported an overall average attendance-enrollment ratio of .693(97 of 140).

B) Teachers characterized the children's problems using a variety of labels. Children tended to be seen as:

Educationally retarded (8)
Hyperactive (7)
Aggressive (9)
Hostile toward authority (6)
School adjustment problems (6)
Unable to relate to adults (9)
Having few inner controls (6)
Short attention span-frustration tolerance (5)

Children tended less to be seen as:

Fearful (2)
Dependent (3)
Poor self-concept (3)
Unable to relate to peers (3)
Immature (3)
Insecure (2)
Having problems to identification (1)
Having environmental problems (1)

C) In assessing the children's academic functioning, almost all teachers noted the wide range of abilities in their classes. Fourteen teachers felt that the majority of children were functioning below expected grade-level in either reading or mathematics. Eight teachers expressed their perception that "the boys, with a little help, could probably be good students." Four teachers felt that emotional problems were blocks to the pupils' learning.

As one perceptive teacher said:

"Students are working from the 4th grade level up to 9th grade. Although reading levels and math aptitudes vary according to the individual, all share the problems of instant frustration, poor concentration, inability to muster effort needed to achieve, fear of failure, and lack of confidence."

D) Teachers were asked to define their responsibilities in the class in order of

their perceived importance. A ranking of 1 indicates that this was the teacher's perceived primary responsibility.

Table 5
Teacher Ranking of Responsibilities

Responsibilities	1	2	3	4	5
Developing social behavior	9	4	4	1	0
Teaching and learning skills	4	7	3	3	0
Individual and group counselling	3	3	4	0	0
Building self-concepts	3	5	5	0	0
Working with families	0	0	1	3	1
Developing Community Resources	0	0	0	1	1
Disseminating information	0	0	0	1	1

The results of the data indicate that teachers tend to see dealing with social-emotional aspects of the pupils' behavior as being their primary responsibility. The second ranking responsibility is concern for teaching and learning skills. However, while we asked the teachers to rank in order of importance, the implications of the data are unclear, i.e., does the teacher really perceive the teaching and learning of skills to be of secondary importance or does he feel that the children will be unable to learn until primary presenting problems can be coped with?

E) Teachers were requested to express their perceptions as to the eventual capabilities of their pupils to return to regular classes as this was a stated goal of the Operation Return Project.

return to regular public school classes = 82

require lengthy special class placement = 59

need institutional care, e.g., mental hospital = 12

Results indicate that teachers felt that slightly more than 50 per cent of the

pupils (.536, 82 of 153) would return to public school classes, while an almost equal number (.464, 71 of 153) would require lengthy placement or more intensive help.

Similarly, teachers were asked the type of adjustment which their pupils would make after a year in the program.

Table 6
Teacher prediction of Pupil Adjustment

Ratings	Personal Adjustment (Number of Pupils	Academic Adjustment (Number of Pupils)
Satisfactory	60	56
Marginal	82	66
Unsatisfactory	26	36

Results indicate that teachers believed a sizable majority of pupils would make, at best, a marginal personal adjustment (.643, 108 of 168) while the minority would be seen as having made a satisfactory personal adjustment (.356, 60 of 168). An almost identical pattern appeared in relation to the type of academic adjustment which teachers felt would be made. The majority of pupils would probably make only a marginal academic adjustment (.643, 102 of 158), while many fewer pupils would be rated satisfactory (.354, 56 of 158). Interestingly, more than 1/5 of the pupils were viewed as making a clearly unsatisfactory academic adjustment (.228, 36 of 158).

The results seem to have direct implication for the stated goals of Operation Return, if the teachers perceptions prove to be valid. Whatever the theoretical efficacy of the techniques employed by Operation Return staff, it appears as if a large number of pupils will require more than a years stay in the Operation Return classroom to make even a marginal adjustment. This is clearly antithetical to the goals of this intensive, remediated program which explicitly seeks to return children to regular public school settings in a brief period of time. Since early and prompt return was a particularly noteworthy innovative goal, the evaluators must question

whether failure to meet that goal does not cause Operation Return to overlap with other programs administered through the Bureau of Socially Maladjusted Children, e.g., Day Schools for Socially Maladjusted Children (formerly "600 Schools")?

F) As part of the assessment of the appropriateness of the academic program for the Operation Return population and as part of the evaluation of the quality of that program, teachers were asked to delineate how classroom time was spent during a typical week.

The range of total time spent in teaching curriculum areas commonly construed as academics was from 12½ per cent to 100 per cent (one teacher who taught a specific subject area claimed to devote all her time to that area). Fifteen of the 19 teachers spent from 50 per cent to 89 per cent of their time on academics. In the academic areas of reading (including spelling, writing, etc.) and mathematics, 12 teachers spent from 20 to 29 per cent of the time in each area. In Social Studies, 10 teachers spent from 10 to 19 per cent of their time and, in Science, 11 teachers spent from 1 to 9 per cent of their time.

In the non-academic curriculum areas 12 teachers devoted from 1 – 15 per cent of the time to art and 15 teachers worked with music from 0 – 10 per cent of the time. As for Shop, 13 teachers indicated having spent no time in the area. Time spent in recreation or gym ranged rather evenly from 0 – 29 per cent of time.

Individual or group discussions about behavior tended to occupy from 1 – 19 per cent of time for 12 teachers. One teacher spent 50 per cent of time on this area.

Infrequently, time was spent in "free play", on trips, on "health and safety" areas, and with quiet games.

The response to whether appropriate instructional materials were available to the teacher in sufficient quality yielded 10 negative replies. Of the nine teachers who answered in the affirmative, three said that it had only been through the help of the schools in which the teacher had taught prior to Operation Return that sufficient supplies had been obtained. Many supplies which arrived were inappropriate, e.g., out of date textbooks, readers.

Among the teachers' suggestions for supplies which were needed were:

High interest, low ability readers
Up to date texts
Typewriters
Tape recorders
Phonograph records
Projectors
Television sets
Arts and Crafts Materials
Shop Materials

There were several examples of phonographs with no records and records with no phonographs. In addition, expectations for girls to have gymsuits and sneakers were seen to be inappropriate unless these items were purchased for them.

Teachers were then asked whether they had received funds for the purchase of necessary items. Only 12 of the 19 teachers had received funds at all and the amounts of money received varied from $20 to $155 depending on the number of students in the class. However, one teacher said that he was receiving 25c a day per child while another teacher said that he was receiving 35c a day per student. Some teachers had been receiving funds since September, others had just received the funds in April and still others had failed to receive any funds although they had been promised. Several teachers indicated that they had spent considerable amounts of their own money without reimbursement.

Teachers receiving funds tended to spend them on food, gifts, parties, occasional field trips and limited instructional materials. One teacher indicated he was buying newspapers for the pupils.

When asked about materials which they had made, 13 teachers indicated having done so. Unfortunately, very few of these materials were made available for evaluation. Of the materials mentioned, rexographed sheets and stencils were cited more frequently. Next in frequency came bulletin boards, posters, and charts for display and learning purposes. In addition, bead boards, flash cards, multiplication tables, and phonic games were mentioned. One teacher indicated curtains had been

made for the room and another teacher had created a mural.

G) Teachers were asked to share their feeling about the setting in which their classroom functioned. The purpose of the question was to assess the relation of the class environment to the quality of the educational program. Since a stated innovative goal of the Operation Return Project was to test this relationship in settings away from the traditional public school, the Evaluation team was very interested in the responses.

The NYU evaluation staff observed 7 Operation Return classes functioning in four public schools and 12 Operation Return classes functioning in eight non-public school settings. Among the non-public school settings were a YMHA, a church, Boy's Club, storefront, Salvation Army and a community center in a housing project. The staff observers' report on the adequacy of the facilities will appear later in this report.

As would be expected, teachers reported a number of advantages and disadvantages inherent in each setting. There was no setting totally free of problems although the teachers were able to demonstrate an objective relationship between positive and negative values. The following teacher reports typify the range of responses to the question:

Class at the Boys' Club

Advantages: Removing students from school environment and their past failures and unrealistic, frustrating rules and demands. Having a room they can call their own. The atmosphere becomes less formal.

Disadvantages: Having pool tables always in sight, conflict with boys club rules, fear of damaging property, students feeling of being "put away."

Classes in a Church

Advantages: The church setting seems to have a pacifying and stabilizing effect on the pupils.

Disadvantages: The room size is inadequate. Can only occasionally use the gym. No telephone for Operation Return staff; only used by the church. Must be careful that pupils don't get into trouble with children from a private school who also use the church's facilities.

Class at the YMHA

Advantages: Almost ideal. Have contact with all age groups. No jarring bell system. Incredible physical plant. Highly helpful and supportive "Y" staff.

Disadvantages: Lunch facilities at another school. Telephone and postage at another school. Para-professional payroll at another school.

Class in a Public School

I feel it is a good idea for us to be in a school because it gives the correct atmosphere for a learning situation. Since the boys are in a school, there is always a certain mood present – that this is a place where they are to do their work.

I can suggest one improvement, that is to be in a school that has recreation facilities and also facilities for providing adequate lunches for the boys.

Clas in a Public School

Advantages: Lunch availabie. Security of school building – in case of accident, etc. Support of principal, supplies.

Disadvantages: Children are outsiders in the school. Many restraints are placed on the children. Higher standard of behavior is required of Operation Return pupils than is required of other children in the school.

Class in a Public School

It is both an advantage and disadvantage. It would be advantageous in a Public School which was interested in and willing to cooperate with Operation Return

because they could lend materials and give encouragement.

In this case, however, the school makes it more difficult. They don't lend materials. If anything is destroyed in the school, the Operation Return children are blamed. The children, thus, must be constantly supervised.

The results tend to deny the notion that merely by removing a class from the Public School setting will solve educational environment problems. Results, rather, tend to support the hupothesis that careful pre-planning must be accomplished before any socio-physical milieu is introduced as a variable into the Project. Teachers report significant disadvantages with all settings; some disadvantages appear to be remediable while others, which refer to inadequacy of the physical plant, appear condemning.

The NYU evaluation team can make no firm statement about the relationship of type of educational setting to the effectiveness of the Operation Return Project at this point. It must be noted, however, that generally ineffective pre-planning for the introduction of Operation Return children into both public and private facilities would vitiate theoretical conceptions of relative setting merits.

H) Teachers were asked to delineate the type of teaching methodology which they used with their class. We were particularly interested in techniques of motivation, grouping, evaluation, and reinforcement. While individual responses varied, the group showed relatively distinct patterns.

Teachers most characterized their instruction by:

a) relating to real life experiences (11)
b) being individualized (13)
c) emphasizing short lessons with immediate success (7)
d) grouping by age, individual ability and personality (8)
e) evaluating growth through use of standardized tests (8)
f) evaluating growth through use of teacher-made tests (7)
g) being reinforced through verbal praise (10)
h) using extrinsic rewards (9)

Teachers less frequently characterized their instruction by:

a) being structured (3)
b) using students to teach one another (3)
c) group-centered (2)
d) employing audio-visual techniques (4)
e) taking trips (3)
f) grouping by scores or grades (3)
g) having students evaluate themselves (3)
h) emphasizing competition (3)

Individual teaching patterns indicated that teachers who:

tended to use	tended not to use
–work related to real life	–competition
–verbal praise	–extrinsic rewards
–emphasized individualized instruction	–grouping by socres

Recommendations

While a number of recommendations have been made as part of the analysis of the results obtained in this section of the Teacher Interview Form, several comments should be expressed as to the teaching behavior delineated by Operation Return staff.

The teachers self-perceptions of their behavior indicated that most saw themselves as relatively flexible, pupil-centered, and presenting materials and instruction in manner prescribed by the individual needs of their children. A large minority, however, stated that they were unsuccessful in motivating the children to learn, really did not evaluate pupil growth, and used rewards such as recreational privileges, marks or "stars." In other words, teachers may be repeating the same kinds of behaviors which the Operation Return children could not tolerate when they were suspended from school.

It is recommended that teachers be encouraged to examine the effect of their own behavior, instructional as well as personal, upon the children. This may be accomplished through trained supervisors on either an individual or seminar basis.

Materials and resource centers should be employed to help the teacher become aware of the nature and types of instructional materials which have already been developed for the disturbed child. This would enable the teacher to become an intelligent consumer of materials as well as direct his own creative efforts in the making of materials.

Antiquated methods for disbursement of materials must also be corrected. A central supply depot should be established which would contain current materials rather than "left-overs." Procedures for disbursement of materials need to be enacted to assure prompt receipt of teacher-requested resources.

IV. Classroom Climate and Control

This section was developed in order to gain information on the methods which teachers used to establish controls and create the kind of climate necessary for learning.

A) Six of the teachers said that they had made rules in advance which the boys had to follow. Nine of the teachers indicated that rules were made as the need for them arose. Eight teachers said that rules were made by the pupils with the teacher and that the pupils retained a great deal of responsibility for self-enforcement.

Examples:

"Rules must be established by the teacher."

"We had basic rules formulated before the boys came in September. When something new comes up, the incident is discussed by the teacher and the student to determine whether or not it is acceptable and what punishment should be handed out."

"The children will establish rules as they are needed and likewise for limits. They realize that this is their project and they must help us to make it a success."

"After the first few days of class, I observed what was needed in the way of discipline. I then straightforwardly told the boys what was to be allowed and what

wasn't and why. Up to now, except for occasional flare-ups, this has worked very well.

B) When teachers were asked in which areas rules or limits were imposed, 14 teachers mentioned control of aggressive and anti-social behavior. Ten teachers cited rules which controlled pupil movement, attendance or punctuality. Six teachers referred to rules about manner of dress, eating, or smoking.

Examples:

"Don't kick holes in the door"

"No fighting"

"No violence"

"No weapons in school"

"People coming in late will stay after school"

"Don't leave the building"

"Do not loiter in the halls'

"Sign out of room sheets when leaving or returning"

"Ties must be worn to school"

"Gum chewing is not permitted'

"No eating in class"

"No smoking"

C) When asked how children respond to the controls, eight teachers answered "quite well", seven teachers answered "keep them most of the time", and four teachers answered "rules are accepted occasionally." Fourteen teachers related infractions of the rules which ranged from "some" to "many".

Examples:

"They have accepted (with some infractions) the major ones. The minor ones are not as firmly enforced and are broken more often."

"At first it was difficult for them to follow the rules because they never followed them before. Now, they have accepted these rules and are able to function–except for occasional flare-ups."

"They break them, of course, but we all are our brothers' keeper. One must check on the other.

When asked about methods to maintain controls, 10 teachers answered that verbal "reminders" and discussions were used either with the individual offender or with the group; six teachers answered that pupils were deprived of food (e.g., treats, cookies, snacks), privileges, or favorite activities; and five teachers said that children might be excluded from class.

Examples:

"Rules are explained and discussed from the very beginning. Also, someone from the District Office emphasized the need to obey these rules in meeting with the students. Students realize that to disobey rules could lead to dismissal."

"We talk to the child about what he has done. Usually the child knows he is wrong and will say so. He then can suggest his own punishment. We try not to impose our own values on the boys. We hope they will see these values themselves."

D) Teachers were asked to whom could they turn for help with negative behavior. Three teachers felt that they had no one to turn to for help. The others made a variety of responses. In terms of frequence of selection, the responses were:

Co-Workers, e.g., educational assistant, teacher, etc. (9)

Psychologist (7)

Guidance counselor (6)

District coordinator (5)

Local Agencies (3)

Parents (1)

Teachers who perceived themselves as having no help with negative behavior

felt "on their own" but did not seem overly concerned about it. Only one of the teachers who had external resources stated that the resource was not helpful. This teacher felt that the Psychologist from whom he requested help knew little about the children. The other teachers felt that their resource people helped them to gain insight into the children's behavior, suggested methods for handling disruptive behavior, or were supportive to the teacher's decisions.

V. Relationship with Professional Staff

A) The Educational Assistant

The responses of teachers concerning their roles with the educational assistant were almost totally favorable. Responsibility given to the educational assistant varied from working with individual pupils under the direct guidance of the teacher to co-teacher status with responsibilities being shared as equals. Other responsibilities included taking of attendance, acting as liaison with the family and community, and supervision of lunch periods.

Examples:

"I explain the purpose of the lesson to the educational assistant who will attempt to work with one or more of the children when I am busy with others."

"For a while the relationship was strained because neither of us knew what to do with the other. We then had a meeting and all our hang-ups were aired; since then we have been working together very well."

"He plays a supportive role in all my teaching activities especially in the physical activities."

"She is excellent. We work together as a unit. Where I am having difficulty with a child, she will come in and handle the situation beautifully. We discuss what could be done and what has been done."

Teachers, in general, were satisfied with the role of the educational assistant and made only a few suggestions for changes. The pattern of suggestions indicated

individual problems rather than role-specific difficulties. Where the educational assistant tended to work more with social-emotional problems, teachers requested greater participation in academic affairs. Similarly, where the educational assistant emphasized academic aspects of his role, teachers made responses such as:

"Assistant might take students aside for the purpose of discussing personal problems when the student's behavior suggests such a need." Teachers who had worked with educational assistants before tended to relate more quickly and more positively to the role. One teacher who expressed initial difficulty with the role of educational assistant suggested:

"I would let all new teachers and educational assistants know what their relationship should be and what is expected of each of them. This would cut out much guesswork and save time in setting up a smooth program."

B) The Family Assistant

Most teachers indicated a similar type of positive response to the role of family assistant. The basic responsibility of the family assistant was to work with the pupil's family so as to provide the staff with information relevant ot the child's behavior in the classroom. Contact would be initiated with the pupil's home in case of absence or misbehavior. Other responsibilities indicated by several teachers were helping out with lunch and "filling in" during classroom time if the need arose.

Three teachers felt the need for greater clarification of the family assistant's responsibilities. They stated:

"This role must be studied. The role of the family assistant is unclear, and is evolving through trial and error."

"Not sure what her role is. Would like to see it clarified. She shouldn't come into the room but should work more closely with the social worker."

"I would just like a detailed statement of what her activities are supposed to be."

C) The Psychologist/Social Worker

Twelve of the teachers responding to the ways in which they related to the psychologist or social worker indicated a good deal of dissatisfaction about how the role was being fulfilled. Nine of these teachers indicated never or seldom having contact with a psychologist or social worker and that most of the people functioning in the role had just begun so that valuable relationships were not yet established.

Examples:

"The first one seldom came in for consultation. New one has been on the job too short a time. The former one wrote a report about which I heard nothing–not unusual for New York City, so its not alarming."

"Since he has not been with us too long, and since he is only with us at most twice a week, it has been very difficult for me to build up anything more than just a casual relationship with him."

"We don't have one."

Those teachers who had established on-going contacts with the psychologist or social worker felt that, in most cases, he could make an important contribution to the class' functioning. Six teachers cited the psychologist or social workers ability to help develop insight into children's behavior, apprise the teacher of the child's academic functioning, and give pertinent information about the home life of the pupil. There were, however, a few two-edged comments:

"He tests the children. I barely know him."

"The psychologist, when we get to meet with him, can give us insight into what is going on in the child's own mind."

Suggestions for changes in the psychologist's or social worker's role almost invariably referred to the amount of time which he should devote to the Project of the manner in which available time should be expended.

Examples:

"Since he comes only one time a week and this had just begun in the past month on the one day that there's a staff meeting, I would make him more available to Operation Return."

"He should have a regular schedule of class visits and conferences with the staff."

"I would like them to come in and work with kids on an ongoing, continual basis."

D) District Coordinator

Almost all teachers reported contacts with the Operation Return District Coordinator. He is seen as a resource person who could be effective in the following ways:

Board of Education legal concerns (8)

Funds, supplies (6)

Discipline (4)

Return to regular schools (4)

Problems, complaints, advice (4)

Responses to ways in which the district coordinator's role might be advantageously changed yielded several desires for more close contact or frequent meetings. Three teachers also stated that they would like contact with the Board of Education's central Operation Return.

VI. Supervision and In-Service Training

A) Supervision of Operation Return teachers was notable for its lack of consistency. Five teachers indicated that there was no outside supervision of their work, eight teachers indicated occasional supervision by the district coordinator, four teachers said they were supervised by co-teachers, and two teachers said they were supervised by the psychologist or guidance counselor.

The type of supervision varied. Five of the 13 teachers receiving supervision as "informal", occurring once a month or less, frequently by telephone or unannounced visits. Five teachers indicated being supervised through inspection of plan books and site-visits by the supervisor at least twice a month. Three teachers indicated weekly conferences with supervision.

All thirteen teachers receiving supervision felt that it was helpful to them in different ways.

Example:

"Has offered support and encouragement, as well as suggestions."

"It points out what I may be doing wrong, suggests what I can do to help it; it also tells me when I am going along well."

"It is often difficult to get an "overview" of a student or classroom when involved in it on a daily and hourly basis."

Suggestions for improvement of supervision yielded desire for increased or more intensive forms of supervision. Five teachers felt that a supervisor should be present at all times while one teacher did not want to be supervised at all. Three teachers felt that supervision should come from a person with an intensive knowledge of the pupils' problems rather than from an administrator.

B) Orientation Sessions

Thirteen of the teachers had some form of orientation sessions which ranged in number from 2 to 12. It appears that the teachers who had no orientation either entered Operation Return in mid-year or were absent for the sessions scheduled.

Of the thirteen teachers receiving Orientation 10 indicated that the sessions were helpful to them.

Examples:

"They helped guide the setting up of the program of instruction and clearly defined the requirements of the staff members."

"It prepared me better to cope with the boys when they came in and it gave me a much better idea about what to expect since the staff could relate their previous experiences with the program."

The three teachers who felt that the orientation sessions were not valuable commented that they "didn't need it" or that it was too vague and it needed to spell out more specifically the requirements of the program.

C) In-Service Training

Thirteen teachers felt that they had received no In-Service Training. The other six teachers defined in-service training in various ways. Two teachers felt that the co-teachers comments upon their teaching behaviors were an excellent mode of training. As one teacher stated:

"After the children go home, my co-teacher and I discuss some of my experiences with the children during the day and how I might have better handled the situation."

Another teacher commented:

"I consider this type of on-the-job training an invaluable aid in the building up of good teachers. This is more important to me than holding classes for teachers because I reject the position of student-teacher; but a one-to-one relationship based on meaningful criticisms and suggestions will go a lot farther than a how-to-do-it course."

Several other teachers mentioned discussions at conferences as a form of training. The training, however, was of limited value as exemplified by one teacher's perception:

"The conference was helpful–for example, errors in filling out applications for High School were avoided."

VII. Teacher's Perceptions of the Goals of the Project

A) Of the teachers interviewed as part of the Evaluation, 14 indicated that

they would take a job with Operation Return again next year, four teachers were "not sure" and one teacher would definitely not.

Reasons for wanting to return varied, but the theme of feeling positively about the impact of the work they were doing with the children ran through the teachers' responses.

Examples:

"I have gotten a great deal of satisfaction in working with these boys. I never dreamed that I would have a relationship with these children that is as close as I do. I feel very proud to be a part of Operation Return. I feel very rewarded to see the tremendous growth in all of our boys in all respects."

"I find it a very rewarding experience to be able to help these boys who no one else could. Just as rewarding is to see growth and direction in these boys and to know that I was partly responsible for it."

Teachers who were undecided about returning next year cited lack of personal or professional satisfaction as reasons.

Examples:

"I'd have to wait to evaluate how effective I feel I've been and could be long with how rewarding it has been for myself personally."

"I have not felt as successful as I had hoped—24 hours are simply not enough if all this coordination and planning is to be done."

Unfortunately, the teacher who was sure of not returning next year offered no reason for his position.

B) All teachers saw the goals of the Operation Return Project to be highly worthwhile. They identified the goals similarly to the goals enumerated by the project's proposal.

Example:

"Return a better adjusted child to the home school so that he or she may be

able to function in a more normal atmosphere. Attempt to improve, academically, all suspended children who need such help especially in reading and math."

"The records of past failures and frustrations have prevented them from working satisfactorily and from making a satisfactory adjustment in the regular school program. Our basic purpose is to plan a curriculum geared around meeting their basic needs and to help the boys form a better self-image, gain a sense of respect for authority, and to increase a desire for learning. Our basic aim is to return the boys to a regular class."

C) When asked to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the program, teachers exhibited a pattern almost identical to their major satisfactions and discouragements with the program. Of interest was the fact that some teachers mentioned aspects of the program as strengths while other teachers perceived the same aspects in a difference light.

Among the strengths cited and their frequency were:

a) Establishment of positive relationships with the children (9)
b) The improvement of skills through departmentalization, individualized instruction, and small classes (8)
c) Contacts with the home (5)
d) Maintaining difficult children (5)
e) Paraprofessional involvement (5)
f) Relaxed atmosphere, high morale, flexibility (5)
g) Contacts with the home (4)

Among the weaknesses cited and their frequency were:

a) Inadequacy of the physical setting (8)
b) Lack of supplies, funds (7)

c) Lack of supportive help (7)

d) Inability to maintain difficult children (5)

e) Severe pathology of the children (5)

f) Lack of control over intake policies (4)

g) Hostility of schools or community to the children (4)

An interesting response to the weaknesses of the Program deserves special note. Two teachers felt that the fact that children were kept in Operation Return for long periods of time with its high degree of individual attention and guidance might be detrimental to the children.

Examples:

"New environment is atypical. Child probably functions better here, but his atypical situation may actually hinder his adjustment to normal classroom environments."

"There is the danger of a "heaven situation" where the child likes the setting so much that he does not want to return to a regular school.

Analysis of Educational Assistant Interview Form

The Educational Assistant Interview Form was developed in order to obtain information directly from the Educational Assistant with respect to the following areas:

I. Recruitment and Hiring

II. The Educational Assistant's Background and Previous Work Experience

III. The Educational Assistant's Perception of the Use of Time

IV. Relationships with the Teachers

V. Supervision and In-Service Training

VI. Awareness of Goals of Operation Return

VII. Recommendations of the Educational Assistant for Improvement of Operation Return

In each of these areas, educational assistants were asked to respond to these questions in a face-to-face interview. Prior to the interview, copies of the EAIF had been mailed to each Educational Assistant to enable respondents to have more opportunity to think about the areas under investigation. The Educational Assistant Interview Form is included as an appendix to this report. A total of 17 educational assistants responded to the EAIF and the following results were obtained:

I. Recruitment and Hiring

The major factor given for joining Operation Return was an expressed interest in working with children. This response was given by 14 of the 17 educational assistants interviewed. A second response in popularity was "out of work and needing a job", which was given by four of the respondents, while the proximity of the employment location to the respondent's home was given as a reason by one. The methods of recruitment and hiring were widely varied. In two districts, a sustained program of attempting to attract interest in and application to the program through the community council and Manpower Office followed with systematic interviews involving various representatives of the community was developed to select educational assistants.

Over 50 per cent of the educational assistants interviewed for this study had been employed as Educational Assistants in other schools prior to their joining Operation Return. It is not known by the NYU evaluation team what effect of moving already-experienced teacher aides from one program to another was on the programs that were "robbed." It may only be assumed, however, that they were adequately replaced.

II. Educational Background and Work Experience

Of the 17 Educational Assistants interviewed 16 were high school graduates while one has completed the tenth grade and is currently working on a high school equivalency degree. Ten of the Operation Return educational assistants had been employed as teacher aides or in similar roles prior to joining this program.

III. Perception of Time Use

The majority of the educational assistants interviewed reported assisting teachers with records, escorting pupils in and out of the buildings, and supervising lunch periods. In the open ended "other" category, however, each educational assistant specifically mentioned the activities dependent upon individual contact with pupils. For over two-thirds of the educational assistants, this meant giving individual help with lessons or comforting the individual youngsters during emotionally-charged periods. All educational assistants reported these to be the most meaningful and beneficial of the activities engaged in. Feelings generally expressed were that such services 1) gave individual pupils the sense that someone "cared," 2) provided pupils with real help in overcoming academic and emotional difficulties, and 3) allowed the teacher and other pupils to continue other work uninterrupted. Some educational assistants were particularly pleased that they were able to combine warm individual contact with more tangible nurturing during the serving of lunch.

Second most frequently mentioned "other" tasks were "filling in" for teachers and lesson planning. Both activities were felt by those reporting to be beyond their present level of competence and those mentioning those activities indicated that such activities should be performed by teachers "qualified" for the job.

Tasks seen as least beneficial by educational assistants were detailed clerical work and the preparation of lunch trays (not serving of lunches). While acknowledging that someone had to do these jobs, educational assistants believed the former were better suited to secretarial personnel and the latter was relatively unimportant. Three-fourths of the respondents believed all their activities were beneficial and contributed to the overall functioning of the program.

The perceptions of the educational assistants were in part substantiated by the observers of the NYU evaluation team. The role of the educational assistant as a stabilizing force for individual pupils within the class was the most consistently noted observation of their role.

IV. Relationships with the Teachers

Educational assistants, with one exception, reported meeting with the teacher daily or several times weekly to discuss pupils, plan activities, and explore new ways of presenting material. A small number said that formal meetings were scheduled only once or twice a month, but that informal conferences took place as needed. Relationships with the teachers were uniformly described as excellent, (one respondent characterized the relationship as "ideal"). The "give and take" during meetings was praised and prominent feelings of personal worth experienced was expressed. Many respondents reported feeling valued as equals in the enterprise. The majority said that they would in no way change the nature of the professional relationship with the teacher.

Only one respondent reported not meeting with the teacher. This individual planned for each pupil separately, and suggested that closer contact with the teacher would have been beneficial.

Suggestions offered for improving the relationship with teachers generally referred to such factors as insufficient overall planning, insufficient contact between parents and teachers, and failure to discuss certain middle-class expectations.

Most educational assistants indicated that they related to all staff in Operation Return. Where specific Operation Return staff were mentioned, categories, in rank order were, first other educational assistants, second family assistants, third social workers, and fourth, in some instances, coordinators of Operation Return. Relationships were characterized in general was warm, professional, and compatible. "Give and take" and a feeling of being "equal" were mentioned in this connection, and only certain top administrative people were seen as distant. In one instance the psychologist was seen as somewhat aloof. The majority reported that they had been encouraged by professional staff meetings to express their opinions at staff meetings. One specific comment given by one educational assistant is worth mentioning specifically. In this individual's perception, the relationship between the white teacher and a black educational assistant served as a useful model for children's

perception–seeing a personal and equal relationship as a valuable learning experience. Suggestions given by educational assistants for changing the nature of the educational assistant's role ranged from none to more active participation in teaching, receiving more help with the preparation of academic tasks, and more pre-enrollment information about the pupils. While most expressed a liking for the role, there was a consistent desire for better preparation for work with academically and emotionally troubled youngsters. More help from the District Office in terms of financial and moral support was another response elicited.

V. Supervision and In-Service Training

Most educational assistants experienced their supervision from the classroom teacher and believed the supervision helpful in both understanding and helping the pupils. Again, there was a request for more direct supervision of academic tasks, and more help in dealing with the emotionally disturbed pupil. All wanted more help in the broad areas of understanding pupil needs. Those who experienced little supervision felt somewhat cut off from classroom experiences.

With respect both orientation and in-service training, over one-half reported as having had no formal orientation to the Operation Return Program except during the period of the strike. A small proportion had attended general orientation sessions prior to the arrival of the pupils, and even a smaller number indicated attendance at continuing sessions. All who reported having attended sessions found them helpful. They reported feeling better prepared to meet the pupils and to continue with the job that they had, and, in addition reported feelings of belonging. The sessions reportedly consisted, for the most part, of planning and discussing curriculum. One individual seems to appear to have attended sessions not geared for Operation Return and found them irrelevant. Those who had been exposed to orientation sessions suggested more and more regularly scheduled orientation programs. Those who had not attended orientation sessions, expressed the feeling that orientation would be helpful. A few respondents specifically requested that a

psychologist be present at such sessions. A majority of respondents had reported not receiving in-service training of any but the informal kind. Some educational assistants considered teacher conferences as a sort of on-the-job training and felt they had been helped by them. Regular in-service training in two areas–problems of emotionally disturbed children and working in broad academic areas–was uniformly requested.

VI. Perception of Goals

All educational assistants expressed in different ways understanding the Project's overall aim. The objective most frequently and explicitly mentioned was preparing the pupil to return to a "normal" classroom. General adjustment, both social and educational, was also frequently mentioned. It should be noted that only one respondent, however, made any mention or increasing family participation in the learning experiences of the child.

VII. Recommendations for Improvement

Educational assistants saw the strengths of the program as being 1) the opportunity for individualized instruction and attention, 2) a good atmosphere for both staff and pupils, 3) good race relationships which might serve to change pupils impressions in this area, and 4) the obtaining of additional community support for the educational program. Weaknesses were listed as follows: 1) inadequate facilities, 2) not enough money available for supplies or transportation to the instructional setting. In addition two individuals reported a concern for the absence of a qualified substitute teacher. Peripheral concerns reported by the educational assistants included a sense of isolation from the District Coordinator, lack of representation on recommendations for continuing the project, and in one instance, lack of personal recognition for work done. Overall, however, the educational assistant was seen as functioning as a very valuable part of the Operation Return team. Their own personal satisfaction may be best expressed in the fact that of the 17 assistants

interviewed, 13 stated unequivocally that they would return to the program were they given the opportunity. The reasons most frequently given involved a deep attachment to pupils, belief in the program, and a sense of personal satisfaction of helping. Three were unsure if they'd return to the project; all because they found the salary inadequate, while one reported that his plans currently did not involve returning in the following year but hoped to have the opportunity to do so in the future.

Recommendations

In general, the NYU evaluation team concluded from both the interviews with educational assistants as well as classroom observations that the educational assistant proved himself to be a vital part of the program. Operation Return evidently has been relatively, if almost accidentally, successful in recruiting a substantial number of highly-motivated and interested individuals dedicated to assisting the kinds of young pupils placed in the Operation Return program. It is clear, however, that the project did not take advantage of the high motivation for additional learning and upgrading of the competency possessed by the Educational Assistants in the provision of a continuing planned program with in-service training. It is the contention of the evaluation team that attention must be given to the expressed needs of the staff in any project. The difficulty of working with the type of pupils represented in this program requires continuing support from the District Office with respect to both supervision and emotional support of the participants. Expressed difficulty in obtaining reimbursement of small expenditures of petty cash are, in the opinion of the research team, inexcusable. Of concern to the evaluation team was the absence from educational assistants' perceptions of project goals the developing of closer relationship with the home in support of the students' educational experiences. It should also be noted that the psychologist and social worker were not generally seen as helpful by educational assistants interviewed for this evaluation.

Worthy of particular commendation is the extremely fine working relationships obtained in the large majority of Operation Return instructional settings. The teachers and the educational assistants in most cases studied effected close, equal, and positve relationships which cannot help but further the goals of the project as well as the acceptance of the project by community at large. Studies should be conducted by employing districts to the practice of selecting family assistants for special projects from other projects. The practice of moving educational assistants from setting to setting should be looked at carefully with respect to the effect of both removing such signficant figures from one group of children to another. No statement, however, can be made in this evaluation as to the effect of such practices.

Analysis of the Family Assistant Interview Form

The FAIF was developed along the same lines as the Educational Assistant Interview Form. Nine of the ten family assistants were interviewed. The following sections of those interviews were selected as important for analysis of this report.

I. Recruitment and Hiring
II. Use of Time
III. Relationships with the Teacher
IV. Relationships with Homes
V. Supervision and Training
VI. Awareness of Project Goals

I. Recruitment and Hiring

The recruitment of the family assistants appeared to be the most sporadic of all personnel employed in Operation Return. Most commonly reported responses were "heard about Operation Return from a friend" already working by the school, or notified of the opportunity by a community council. In two instances the family

assistants were already employed in that position in another project, while others reported hearing of the project from the Operation Return Coordinator, notified of it through a welfare council or other informal methods of communication.

II. Use of Time

The majority of family assistants reported spending over 50 per cent of their time in activities not directly related to family liaison work. Some family assistants reported that they rarely visited homes (although all reported calling for youngsters who did not report to school). Only one family assistant indicated that he spent more than 30 per cent of his time making home visits, and some stated they made as few as two visits a year. Meetings with parents, however, accounted for approximately 10 per cent of some family assistants' time. Miscellaneous other activities such as record-keeping, planning activities, and generally "supervising" the pupils seemed to account for the greater part of the family assistants' time on the job. Most respondents failed to give a detailed breakdown of times spent in each area or of differences between actual time spent, ideal time spent and expected time spent. It was, therefore, somewhat difficult to assess the accuracy of the picture of the family assistant's role. Those who provided such information expressed a desire, however, to spend wither the same amount of time or slightly more time in direct family contact. The Operation Return evaluation team would infer from this report that family assistants did not have an appropriate perception of their role in support of one of the major Operation Return objectives, e.g., maintaining or establishing a closer family involvement with school efforts of their children.

III. Relationships with the Teacher

Relationships with the teachers reported by the Operation Return family assistants appeared to be more distant than those expressed by the educational assistants. The family assistant evidently experienced himself as more of a peripheral member of this project. All but one family assistant reported being informed by

teachers when a family was contacted, but a small proportion indicated that this was not always the case in the past, whereas currently teachers were now notifying them. One family assistant stated that the teacher sometimes kept her informed and other times did not. Most family assistants interviewed believed the arrangement was satisfactory, although none appeared to be enthusiastic, while several reported that the relationships with the teachers with respect to family contact was not really adequate.

IV. Relationships with the Home

Most family assistants, somewhat surprisingly, described their relationships as helpful or good, and they reported the value of their work most frequently as developing trust in parents, deepening relationships with pupils through home contact, developing community cohesion, and generally bringing the school and home closer together. This contrasted rather interestingly with responses to the question involving goals of the project where only 2 of the 9 family assistants interviewed mentioned closer home school cooperation as a major project goal. The primary vehicle by which such home contact was initiated apparently was the report of home visitations made after a maximum of two-days absence. Those family assistants who reported not making such a visitation on the first day, tended to call the home. Teachers most frequently initiated requests for this service, although many family assistants indicated they did this on their own, taking it as one of their prime functions of the program. All family assistants reported seeing such home contact as a necessary part of their job. This contact, however, appeared to appear more frequently with the pupil rather than with the parents. Other activities reported by family assistants included escorting students for medical services, leading arts and crafts lessons, keeping records, writing to the home, and escorting pupils to special services. Only one family assistant thought that any of these activities (escorting to doctor) should be performed by someone else. Suggestions for additional activities to be performed by others included the development of parent workshops, after-school programs, and community relations.

V. Supervision and In-Service Training

The majority of family assistants indicated their supervision was effected by the teacher. The second most frequent supervisor reported was the psychologist, while a few family assistants listed the Operation Return Coordinator. Conferences were the most frequent form of communication between supervisor and assistant, but the frequency and structuring of these meetings varied greatly. These meetings ranged from the infrequent, irregularly scheduled talks to daily conferences following more or less regular patterns. Those indicating less structured modes rated supervision generally less helpful than those that had more contact with supervisors. Few were enthusiastic about their supervisory relationships, although several found them to be moderately helpful. In-service experiences were reported to include a variety of meetings ranging from none at all to regular meetings with the full staff and psychologist. Most frequently reported meetings were held 2 or 3 times a month and the majority of family assistants interviewed found such meetings quite helpful from the viewpoint of exchanging information and communicating with other family workers in the project. Some indicated that the meetings varied in helpfulness, depending on the family assistant's need at a particular time. Only a small proportion of family assistants thought more meetings might be helpful in marked contrast to the experiences reported by the Educational Assistants.

VI. Awareness of Project Goals

Family assistants reported a general grasp of the goals of Operation Return. Most family assistants frequently mentioned adjustment and better socialization and all family assistants mentioned return to regular classroom instruction. Only two of the nine family assistants interviewed, however, explicitly mentioned family contact or increased family participation in the pupil's school life as a major goal of the project. The strengths and weaknesses of the Operation Return program as described by family assistants interviewed included the following in rank order. As strengths, individualized attention, a good staff, and increased community involvement were listed. Two family assistants mentioned better understanding of the school situation

as a strength of the program. Weaknesses most frequently mentioned involved lack of funds for needed activities, lack of family assistant in-service training, isolation of the classes from regular school, lack of an adequate back-up staff, and poor to bad communication between the social worker and family assistant and social worker and families.

Recommendations

The NYU evaluation staff would believe that the family assistant's role was not adequately structured and the participation of the family assistant in one of the major objectives of the program was not adequately implemented. It would appear that family assistants need substantially more involvement with the program and need a more well-defined and structured description of job expectations and performance. Additional supervision in a team approach in terms of visiting with families and workshops in developing more adequate interviewing skills should be implemented for such personnel.

Analysis of Program Assessment and Classroom Observation Form

As part of the Operation Return Evaluation, five observers each spent a full day in 19 classes in which the Project was functioning. The observer's purpose was to evaluate the adequacy of the Operation Return instructional program through an analysis of nine areas related directly to classroom performance. These nine areas were:

I. Physical Structure of the Room
II. Effectiveness of Room Arrangement
III. Role and Effectiveness of the Educational Assistant
IV. Use of Materials and Equipment
V. Nature of Curriculum Experiences
VI. Social-Emotional Experiences
VII. Functioning of the Educational Team
VIII. Relationship with Parents
IX. Relationship with Children

As part of their training, the observers meet with the entire Operation Return evaluation staff for a session in which the use and purpose of the evaluation instruments was discussed and direction for the observation process was reinforced. While no attempt was made to measure the exact amount of inter-rater reliability the evaluation staff has reason to believe that differences found are primarily ascribable to teacher or program variables rather than to observer technique or bias.

The classrooms observed came from six school districts in Brooklyn, Queens, and Manhattan. Seven of the classrooms came from four public school settings and 13 classrooms came from eight non-public school settings. All but one teaching station were observed. (For an exact breakdown, see Table 7, page 49)

I. Physical Structure of the Room

In evaluating the adequacy of the physical classroom to meet the needs of the Operation Return program, observers were asked to assess the room size, ventilation, storage space, seating facilities, accessibility to the room, and its freedom from hazards. Observers were asked then to give a rating for the adequacy of the physical structure in general.

Table 7
Setting and Classes by District

Districts	Public School	YMHA	Church	Boy's Club	Storefront	Salvation Army	Housing Proj. Comm. Cntr.	YMCA	*Total
1M				1 (2)					1 (2)
5M			1 (2)						1 (2)
19K	1 (4)								1 (4)
21K	1 (1)	1 (1)					1 (1)	1 (1)	4 (3)
27Q				1 (2)			1 (2)		2 (4)
28Q	2 (2)				1 (1)	1 (1)			4 (4)
*Total	4 (7)	1 (1)	1 (2)	2 (4)	1 (1)	1 (1)	2 (3)	1 (1)	13 (20)

Public Schools

Settings Used = 4

Classes in Settings = (7)

Non-Public Schools

Settings Used = 9

Classes in Settings = (13)

Table 8
Observers' Rating of Physical Structures

Variables	Classifications		
	Inadequate	Marginal	Satisfactory
Room Size	4	5	10
Ventilation	5	2	12
Storage Space	5	5	9
Seating	0	7	12
Accessibility to Room	2	5	12
Freedom from Hazards	0	4	15
*Physical Structure (overall rating)	2	8	9

Results become more relevant to Operation Return, in light of its stated innovative objective to make use of classrooms outside of public schools, when the overall rating "Physical Structure" is analyzed in terms of non-public school vs. public school setting.

Of the two classrooms rated Inadequate, both were from non-public school settings. One classroom, in a community center, drew the following comments:

"The class shares the building with a large nursery and it seems to be a stepchild. Students leave and enter by the back door, have no access to other parts of the building except the bathroom. Because of the proximity of the nursery, the students must be (abnormally) quiet and there was a feeling that the class somehow did not belong there or was not a part of the center in any way."

The other classroom rated Inadequate, in a Boy's Club, evoked this observer response:

"Hardly (appropriate), makeshift headquarters. One end of a large room with a table and benches. No blackboard or place to display any work. Transient."

Of the eight classrooms rated "Marginal", five were located in non-public school facilities and three in public schools. Two of the classes were located in a church and received the following comments:

"The class is combined in this large room and two head teachers take turns teaching subjects. If they do split the class, as planned, it would be difficult to divide the room and would result in two simultaneous classes which could be very distracting. The class is in the basement where there's a large but dreary room with poor lighting and ventilation. They do have use of the adjoining kitchen and smaller room as well as the gym."

Comments on a classroom rated "Marginal" located in a public school in Brooklyn begin with a statement of the hostility of the community and regular teaching staff to the Operation Return project and ended:

"Two classes go on concurrently (without any divider) in one room. This tends to get noisy, making concentration sometimes difficult."

Of the nine classrooms rated "Satisfactory" by the observers, five were located in non-public school settings and four in public schools. Comments on a classroom in a community center were:

"Use community center club rooms in a public housing project. Highly appropriate setting. Rooms are large and airy–removed from public traffic. Very pleasant surroundings."

A classroom located in a public school brought the following comments:

"Very good–located in a school with two adjoining rooms set apart from the mainstream. Two classes function within each room, each with its own blackboard, desks and other facilities."

In summary, only five of the 12 classrooms located in non-public school facilities were rated "Satisfactory" as to physical structure while four of the seven classrooms observed in public schools were assigned that rating.

II. Effectiveness of Room Arrangement

Observers were asked to rate the suitability of the manner in which the teacher arranged the classroom considering the physical conditions under which the teacher had to work. Ratings were made on a five-point scale from Most Unsuitable to Highly Suitable. In all the following tables, the number of teachers or other variables

rated at each point for the scale are given in parentheses.

Table 9
Suitability of Room Arrangement

Most Unsuitable	1	2	3	4	5	Highly Suitable
Number rated	(3	1	3	9	3)	

Observers then rated the flexibility with which the teacher adapted the room for purposes such as demonstration, experimentation, lecture, etc. A similar scale was used.

Table 10
Flexibility of Room Adaptation

Most Unsuitable	1	2	3	4	5	Highly Suitable
Number rated	(0	3	6	4	6)	

Results indicated that, given the physical conditions under which they had to work, teachers tended, as a group, to make good use of existing resources, e.g., space, seating, blackboards, and to adapt these resources in a rather flexible manner to the instructional needs of the pupils.

A teacher rated highly in this area evinced this observer comment:

"Emphasis here was on creative activities and materials were stored conveniently. Students work dominated and gave character to the room."

The importance of room arrangement should not be understated. While a creative teacher cannot compensate for inadequate physical facilities, he can use those facilities to their full potential and thus elucidate those intangible qualities which a non-public school setting would inherently possess, e.g., attitudes, regimentation.

Unfortunately, data indicated that teachers with classrooms which were rated "Unsatisfactory" or "Marginal" as to Physical Structure (see Table 7, p. 49) also received the lowest ratings in room arrangement and flexibility. Observer comments tended to bear out the ratings as seen in these comments on a classroom rated

"Unsatisfactory":

"I didn't see any use of the room to facilitate learning or social contact. The tables are spaced around the room and children sit at separate ones with a large distance in between except when playing games where they sat at the same table. Tables are moved occasionally but not really used."

III. Role and Effectiveness of the Educational Assistant

Since the educational assistant is imperative to concepts of individualization of instruction and emotional growth of the pupils as indicated by the Operation Return proposal, observers were asked to assess the role which he played in the classroom and to evaluate the effectiveness with which he carried out the responsibilities of that role.

Three of the educational assistants were not present on the day of observation. One of the educational assistants takes one day a week off to teach art at the Boys' Club, while a second appears to have a spotty record. The third role was being filled by the family assistant until the regular person returned.

While the educational assistant had a variety of responsibilities, five specific activities were observed with greatest frequency: individual tutoring, preparation of materials, control of misbehavior, administrative routines, e.g., attendance taking, collecting and distributing of papers. Educational Assistants were reported to be working in art with the pupils and to do some group instruction but these appeared to be exceptions.

Observers were asked to rate the general effectiveness of the educational assistant in fulfilling his responsibilities on a five-point scale from Totally Ineffective to Highly Effective.

Table 11
Effectiveness of Educational Assistant

Totally Ineffective	1	2	3	4	5	Highly Effective
Number rated	(0	2	5	4	5)	

Results indicate that a large majority of educational assistants appeared to be doing a very effective job of fulfilling the responsibilities of their role. Observer comments indicated that the most effective educational assistants carried out their responsibilities with a greater quality of competence and sensitivity than their lower rated counterparts. As one observer noted:

"The educational assistant provided a rather unique counterpoint for the teacher. While the teacher verbalized feelings and helped children find ways of expressing them, the educational assistant was like the real world impinging with behavioral norms and expectations which I'm sure were quite familiar to the children and represented the world to which they had to adjust. She was also very well organized and thoughtful in preparing materials and organizing the room."

The qualitative difference of competence and sensitivity between highly effective and less effective educational assistants was underscored by these comments on a low rated person:

"There was a general lack of knowledge about how to teach young children in this class and the educational assistant reflected this lack. He seemed warm and willing but was given little guidance or encouragement by the teacher and his own efforts were most damaging, implying to children that they could not do the work well enough, so he would do it for them."

In addition to the educational assistant, a number of other Operation Return personnel were present on the day of observation. The family assistant was present in 15 classrooms, the Operation Return Coordinator was present in 10 classrooms and various other school personnel, e.g., attendance officer, psychologist, school social worker, substitute teacher, custodian, housing authority supervisor, were seen in different rooms.

IV. Use of Materials and Equipment
and V. Nature of Curriculum Experience

While these areas were evaluated separately on the Program Assessment Form, the analysis of the results of the observation should be viewed as interrelational rather than discrete and, thus, will be discussed jointly.

In evaluating the area "Use of Materials and Equipment," observers were asked to note the types of materials used by the teachers in their instruction and also equipment not specifically used on the day of observation but present in the room. The N.Y.U. evaluation staff assumes that materials present in the room would, at some time, be used with pupils. It is also assumed that materials were available to the teacher which the observer had no way of viewing, e.g., materials stored in locked closets, equipment located in a central or shared facility. The data reported on availability of equipment, thus, should be seen as highly tentative and certainly not as exhaustive. It is presented, however, because of its bearing on the nature of the curriculum experiences presented to pupils during the observers' day. (See Table 12, p. 56-57-58.)

An analysis of the kinds of materials observed by the evaluation staff indicated that equipment and material tended to be quite traditional in design and intent. Observers commented that they saw very few materials which exhibited creativity or originality and that they felt the materials were quite similar to the equipment found in the "regular" classes from which the Operation Return pupils had been suspended. While individual teachers made use of materials which were potentially of great value, e.g., tape recorder, film-strips, there was little other evidence that concepts of audio visual learning or phono-lingual instruction were present.

In other areas as well, the materials were of limited breadth and scope. There were only a few materials related to Negro History or to black Americans. There would appear ample evidence that Black Studies should be a definite focus for pupils in this Program. In mathematics, there was a minimum of conceptually oriented materials, e.g., Cuisennaire Rods, Stern materials, as well as a lack of representational materials, e.g., number lines, discs, bead boards, flannel boards, geometric shapes.

In summary, the evaluation staff believes that materials are limited in intent and scope conveying a traditional pattern of expectations and responses. While there is no denying that effective instruction may occur with limited materials, the purpose of materials is to aid the teacher not to interfere with the learning process.

Observers were asked to indicate the nature of any learning experiences and the interaction among pupils, instructional staff, et. al. during their stay in the classroom. They reported that in the nineteen classes observed:

14 classes participated in a curriculum experience with emphasis upon Language Arts

13 classes participated in a curriculum experience with emphasis upon mathematics

12 classes participated in a curriculum experience with emphasis upon recreation or physical education

9 classes participated in a curriculum experience with emphasis upon art or music

7 classes participated in a curriculum experience with emphasis upon social studies

Table 12
Materials Used or Present in Classrooms

Curriculum Area	Type of Material	No. of Classrooms
Language Arts:	S.R.A. Laboratory Series	8
	Textbooks	8
	Workbooks	8
	Newspapers	3
	Library Books	3
	Rexographs	2
	Readers' Digest Laboratory Series	1

Curriculum Area	Type of Material	No. of Classrooms
	Tape Recorder	1
	Film-strip and Projector	1
	*Charts	4
	*Bulletin Boards	4
	Booklets made by pupils	1
	*Appeared decorational rather than functional.	
Mathematics:	Textbooks	9
	Workbooks	9
	Teacher-prepared materials	5
	Flashcards	4
	Rexograph or Blackboard Problems	4
	Abacus	1
Science:	Texts	3
	Plants	3
	Bulletin Boards	2
	Charts	2
	Diagrams	1
	Magazine	1
Social Studies:	Texts	5
	Books on Black Americans	4
	Pictures on Black Americans	4
Art and Music:	Phonographs	6
	Records	6
	Rhythm Instruments	1
	Crayons	4

Curriculum Area	Type of Material	No. of Classrooms
	Paints	3
	Clay	1
	Popsicle Sticks	1
	Leather Work	1
	Construction Paper	1
Games:	Ping Pong	1
	Monopoly	2
	Anagrams	1
	Checkers	3
	Bingo	1
	Dominoes	1
Gym and Recreation:	Indoor Gym	3
	Outdoor Yards	3
	Basketballs	4
	Hockey Equipment	1
	Rubber Balls	2
	Tennis Rackets	1
	Handballs	1
Shops:	Woodworking Materials	2

6 classes participated in a curriculum experience with emphasis upon Health or Science.

Duration of each curriculum experience ranged from five minutes to 45 minutes in the academic areas with the median time of 15 minutes.

Duration of experiences in recreation, physical education, art and music ranged from 20 minutes to 60 minutes with the median time at 40 minutes.

Academic subjects tended to be taught in the morning while arts and recreation occupied most of the time after lunch

Of interest was the varying patterns of instruction. A number of classrooms were operating instructionally under a "departmentalized" system in which each teacher took responsibility for one or two academic areas. Classrooms utilizing this system tended to spend the most time with academics and also tended to utilize more of the full class day in instruction.

The quality of the instruction was a variable of major interest to the NYU evaluation staff. Observers were asked to evaluate the academic, creative, and recreational aspects of the program on a five-point scale from "Non-existent" to "Highly Emphasized."

Table 13.
Emphasis on Academic Aspects of the Program

Non-existent	1	2	3	4	5	Highly Emphasized
Number rated	(1	4	7	3	4)	

Results indicate that observers saw seven of nineteen classes as highly emphasizing academics and five of 19 as rating poorly in the area. Observer comments show how the quality of instruction varied with the rating:

Comment on a classroom where academics were relatively "highly emphasized" (rating of 4):

"Teacher had academic objective for each activity. Constantly attempted to reinforce learnings and to relate new experiences to the previous ones."

Comment on a classroom where academics were relatively "non-existent" (rating of 2):

"The teacher presents meaningless, uninteresting tasks and then does not attempt to follow through with them in any way. Materials are rather poor and insufficient."

Table 14.
Emphasis on Creative Aspects of the Program

Non-existent	1	2	3	4	5	Highly Emphasized
Number rated	(2	8	5	2	2)	

Results indicate that observers saw four of 19 classes as relatively "highly emphasizing" creative aspects of the program, while 10 of 19 rated well toward the "non-existent" end of the scale.

Comment on a classroom where creative aspects were "highly emphasized" (rating of 5):

"Had students suggest ideas and used them. Encouraged each student to express ideas written, orally, or graphically. Many examples of student work on display in the room; pictures, poems, etc. Room highly decorated with current student work."

Comment on a classroom where creative aspects were relatively "non-existent" (rating of 1):

"Only crayons and drawing paper and apparently these are used with great control by the teacher. Children not encouraged to express themselves in any way.

Table 15.
Emphasis on Recreational Aspects of the Program

Non-existent	1	2	3	4	5	Highly emphasized
Number rated	(3	1	7	7	1)	

Results indicate that observers saw 8 of 19 classes as relatively "highly emphasizing" recreational aspects of the program, while four of 19 classes rated toward the "non-existent" end of the scale.

Comments on a classroom where recreational aspects were relatively "highly emphasized" (rating of 4):

"Being in a Boys' Club there are good recreational facilities available and they

are well used."

Comments on a classroom where recreational aspects were relatively "non-existent" (rating of 2):

"There was no realization of the use or importance of motor activities for these children."

Observers were then asked to make a summary assessment of the teacher's effectiveness in promoting the intellectual development of the children based on ratings of the academic, creative and recreational aspects of the classroom instructional program.

Table 16.
Effectiveness in Promoting Intellectual Development of Children

Not Very Effective	1	2	3	4	5	Very Effective
Number rated	(2	2	6	8	1)	

Results indicate that nine of 19 teachers were rated as relatively "very effective" in promoting the intellectual development of the children (although only one teacher was rated as truly "very effective") while four teachers were seen as relatively "not very effective".

Analysis of the interrelationship between ratings of the three aspects of the instructional program (academics, creativeness, recreation) and the summary assessment indicated, as expected, that teachers who were evaluated as "very effective" in promoting the intellectual development of children also rated as relatively highly emphasizing the individual area. No teacher evaluated in the summary rating as relatively "very effective" was rated less than mid-way (3) on the rating continuum in any individual area.

In order to make the numerical data more meaningful, the comments of two observers on the full-day instruction at two classrooms are cited with particular attention to the interactional qualities of Operation Return staff with the pupils.

Comments on a classroom whose teacher was rated relatively "very effective" in promoting the intellectual development of the children (rating of 4):

"In Reading, individual tutoring was done using the S.R.A. Reading Laboratory Materials, Teacher and Educational Assistant with one or two students at a time. Reading was done orally with teacher helping on pronunciation and diction. Children wrote out answers to exercises.

In Mathematics, the Educational Assistant tutors one boy–assists with solution to problems written on paper.

In Art, children work with modeling clay. All students in one group, supervised by teachers and Educational Assistants. At suggestion of Family Assistant, they constructed animals for a circus. Good, open interaction between students and staff for 40 minutes, the longest period of sustained activity observed.

In Gym, 5 students, teacher and Educational Assistant participated in game of hockey–good interaction. Game of "run the bases". Two boys stand on marker and toss ball back and forth–three boys in center try to run from one base to the other without getting tagged. Teacher participates for several minutes–good interaction."

Comments on the all-day observation in a classroom whose teacher was rated "not very effective" in promoting the intellectual development of the children (rating of 1):

"In Reading, when one student picked up a book of short stories about teenagers the teacher told her to read one story with another girl. The reading level was beyond them and they finally asked me (the observer) to read aloud to them. Teacher made no attempt to direct or help them.

In Science, the teacher told students to copy water cycle picture and explanation from the blackboard and then they would understand it. All except the new girl refused and teacher did not pursue it.

In Social Studies, the teacher noticed a girl looking at the movie section of the newspaper and asked what movie she saw last. "The Detective". He responded by saying that there was very nasty language in that movie.

In Mathematics, sheet of simple problems made for one student. She was also encouraged to play Math game which was too hard for her. Teacher spent afternoon playing Math game with one student who commented that teacher had "lust to lose." Teacher was, in fact, losing.

In Art, one student refused to do Math paper made by teacher and asked to draw. She was given crayons and paper and told what to draw in a most condescending manner.

In Gym, teacher played handball with male students and let girls wander around the playground unaided and they finally left under guise of going to the bathroom. They returned after about 45 minutes.

In Shop, girls were offered patterns and materials and told to get started. After doing so, they were told they were waiting material."

VI. Social-Emotional Experiences

Through investigation of this area of teacher behavior, the NYU evaluation staff wanted to gain information on the methods used to enhance the social and emotional growth of the Operation Return pupils and the degree of effectiveness with which the teacher facilitated such growth. Observers were, thus, instructed to evaluate:

–how the teacher stimulated the growth of positive human relationships.

–how the teacher helped children to understand their own motives and those of other people

–how the teacher promoted the childrens' self-esteem

–how the teacher helped the children to channel their feelings in appropriate ways.

Additionally, observers rated the degree to which the teacher effected each behavior on a five-point scale from "low degree" to "high degree".

Table 17.
Degree to Which Teacher Effects Stimulation of Positive Human Relationships

Low Degree	1	2	3	4	5	High Degree
Number rated	(1	3	3	9	3)	

Results indicate that 12 of 19 teachers were observed as stimulating positive human relationships to a "high degree" while four of 19 were seen as stimulating to a relatively "low degree."

Observer comments exemplified qualitative responses to the numerical data.

Comment on a teacher rated as stimulating positive relationship to a relatively "high degree" (rating of 4):

"Teacher paired students with the more able helping less able in reading. Worked in small groups with free interaction, counselling with students. Setting good example himself."

Comment on a teacher rated as stimulating positive relationships to a "low degree" (rating of 1):

"There was frequent verbal moralizing but he related little to students and was generally condescending. Students made frequent derogatory remarks about him which he ignored, not even willing to relate to them with an argument or a reprimand."

Table 18.
Degree to Which Teacher Helps Children to Understand Their Own Motivation and Those of Other People

Low Degree	1	2	3	4	5	High Degree
Number rated	(5	3	5	4	2)	

Results indicate that six of 19 teachers were rated as helping children to understand motives of selves and others to a relatively "high degree" while eight of

19 teachers were rated as effecting that behavior to a "low degree".

Comment on a teacher rating as helping children to understand motives of selves and others to a relatively "high degree" (rating of 4):

"During filmstrip on safety, teacher asked students to discuss subject's reaction to accident caused by another and how they might have reacted."

Comment on teacher rated as helping children to understand motives of selves and others to a "low degree" (rating of 1):

"Even when a child tried to discuss this, teacher stopped it, used denial mechanisms and encouraged children to do so."

Table 19.

Degree to Which Teacher Promotes Children's Self-Esteem

Low Degree	1	2	3	4	5	High Degree
Number rated	(2	0	4	9	4)	

Results indicate that 13 of 19 teachers were viewed as promoting childrens' self-esteem to a "high degree" while only two teachers were rated "low degree".

As one observer said, commenting on a teacher who promoted childrens' self-esteem to a "high degree" (rating of 5):

"Teacher used praise—he gave genuine deserved praise to each student at some point during the period. He had one student show a picture to others in the group and to other staff."

Table 20.

Degree to Which Teacher Helps Children to Channel Feelings in Appropriate Ways

Low Degree	1	2	3	4	5	High Degree
Number Rated	(4	2	6	6	1)	

Results indicate that seven of 19 teachers were rated as helping children to channel their feelings in appropriate ways to a relatively high degree while six teachers were rated "low degree".

Comments on this aspect of Social-Emotional Behavior paralleled the others, e.g., a comment on a teacher rated as to a "high degree", as helping children channel feelings appropriately (rating of 4) was:

"The teacher is calm, gives individual attention and understanding to a particular problem. Explains the whys behind the rules."

Comments on a teacher rated as helping channel feelings appropriately to a low degree (rating of 2) was:

"The teacher doesn't deal with problems, he distracts children verbally and behaviorally.

Observers were asked to make a summary evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the teacher in promoting the social-emotional development of the children.

Table 21.
Effectiveness of Teacher in Promoting Social-Emotional Growth of Children

Not Very Effective	1	2	3	4	5	Very Effective
Number Rated	(2	2	7	5	3)	

Results indicate that 8 of 19 teachers were rated as relatively effective in promoting the social-emotional development of children (ratings 4 and 5) while 4 teachers were rated as relatively not effective in this area.

In summary, it appears that while 13 of 19 teachers were perceived by observers to promote childrens' self-esteem to a relatively high degree, many fewer teachers received that rating in the areas of helping children to understand their own motives and to channel these feelings appropriately. In the summary rating, as well, only eight teachers were rated as relatively "very effective" in promoting the overall social-emotional development of the children. One hypothesis to explain the discrepancy in ratings is that areas which require children's exploration of their own behavior, i.e., understanding motivation, and channeling feelings, are difficult for the

teacher to facilitate while teachers tend to promote childrens' self-esteem more effectively by giving praise, giving rewards, and giving a smile. In other words, the teacher is more successful in mediating his own behavior than in helping the children to mediate their behavior. Such a hypothesis tends to be confirmed by the observers comments cited previously in discussion of the results of the individual aspects of social-emotional growth.

As a result of their evaluations of the academic, creative, recreational, and social-emotional areas of the Operation Return classroom,–instructional program, observers were asked to determine the main forces of the program.

Table 22.
Focus of the Operation Return Program

Area of Focus	Number of Emphasizing
Intellectual Development	2
Social-Emotional Development	5
Motor Development	0
Both Social and Intellectual Development	8
No focus apparent	4

Results indicate that eight of the 19 classrooms seemed to be meeting the stated goals of Operation Return as to the thrust of the program while four classes had no discernible focus.

Summary and Comments –

In reviewing the data on the Operation Return classroom program of instructional, curriculum and social-emotional experiences provided for and with children, the NYU evaluation staff takes note of the high degree of competence of individual teachers but must express concern that this quality does not pervade a larger percentage of the Operation Return teaching personnel. As discussed previously, poor physical structures and lack of available resources and materials

present an obstruction to the instructional process in some cases and there seems to be evidence that a sizable number of teachers are unable to overcome such obstacles or lack basic teaching or interpersonal-relations skills.

Less than half the teachers were perceived to be relatively "very effective" in promoting the intellectual development of the children (see Table 15) and in promoting the social-emotional growth of the children (see Table 20). Further analysis yields that teachers who were successful in promoting intellectual development of children also tended to be successful in promoting social-emotional development and that such teachers taught their classes in both public and non-public school facilities.

VII. Functioning of the Educational Team.

Since the Operation Return proposal stressed the intensiveness of working with children by a psycho-educational team comprised of mental health, teaching, and paraprofessional staff, the N.Y.U. observers were asked to evaluate the teachers' relationship with the team.

Types of team contacts varied greatly on the day of observation. Almost all teachers worked with Educational Assistants and Family Assistants, about one-half had contacts with Operation Return Coordinators, and one-fifth had contact with a psychologist, social worker or guidance counsellor.

While the role of the Mental Health person seemed relatively distinct in relation to the teacher, other roles seemed to require further clarification. For example:

"Roles have not been defined–is competition. Family Assistant has the greatest seniority in the project. Each staff person "went his own way" in working with the students. No consistency of approach to discipline. They disagreed to front of students to the students' delight."

In some cases it was not the role definition which caused difficulty but the antipathy between adult staff:

"Teacher complained bitterly of the family assistant–feels she is a militant

black woman who sabotages anything teacher tries to do with black children."

Most team relationships were characterized by mutual respect and harmonious conditions, e.g.,

"Very positive relationship with all. Good interaction with Educational Assistant who, while placed in a subordinate role, makes suggestions which teacher accepts. Teacher discussed a student with social worker and family assistant prior to start of instruction. Relationship appeared to be excellent. Very much a team atmosphere evident."

The observer was asked to rate the extent to which the teacher worked with other Operation Return staff as a team. The following table represents a composite rating of the teacher to other staff present on the day of observation on a five-point scale from "no teamwork evident" to "smoothly functioning team."

Table 23.
Extent of Cooperative Work Among Operation Return Staff

None	1	2	3	4	5	Smoothly Functioning
Number rated	(1	3	5	5	5)	

Results indicate that 10 of 19 classrooms evidenced "smoothly functioning" teamwork while four showed poor team cooperation.

VIII. Relations with Parents

During the day of observation, only three teachers had direct contact with parents. Several other teachers said that while no contact was apparent during observations, this was an exception rather than the rule.

The observed contacts with parents varied:

"Telephone call from parent of boy who had just been returned after two week absence due to running away from home, seemed to be a very positive, supportive contact."

"A parent brought her daughter in at the teacher's request to discuss the girl's

smoking in the toilet."

"The mother of a boy about to be admitted to the program visited. Teacher explained the program briefly to her, took down some necessary information and apparently told her some mandatory procedures in admission, e.g., medical examination."

IX. Relationship with Children

While this area is considered separately for analysis, it pertains particularly to the ways in which the teacher stimulates the social and emotional growth of the children.

Of major importance to the NYU evaluation staff was the means by which teachers sought to reinforce socially acceptable behavior and to cause unacceptable behavior to become extinct. Observers were asked to note such methods on a table of frequencies of use.

Table 24.
Methods of Reinforcement for Socially Desirable Behavior

Method	Frequency of Use		
	No Use	Occasional	Frequent
1. Praises (Verbal)	0	5	14
2. Smiles or Nods	1	5	13
3. Pointing Out Child as Good Example	1	12	6
4. Patting, or Other Physical Contact	5	12	2
5. Granting Special Privileges	9	9	1
6. Giving Material Rewards	15	3	1
7. Saying Child Has Pleased Teacher	4	11	4
8. Indicating Child Has Pleased Group	13	2	4

Results indicate that "Verbal Praise" and "Smiles or Nods" were the most frequent means of reinforcing socially desirable behavior while "Giving Material Rewards" and "Indicating Child Has Pleased Group" were least used by teachers.

Table 25.
Methods of Reinforcement to
Facilitate Extinction of
Socially Undesirable Behavior

Method	Frequency of Use		
	No Use	Occasional	Frequent
1. Physical Restraint	8	9	2
2. Removing from Group	8	10	1
3. Calling on Outside Authority	13	5	1
4. Using Words of Shame	9	10	0
5. Ignoring	3	8	8
6. Depriving of Objects	11	8	0
7. Depriving of Privilege	6	13	0
8. Threats	11	8	0
9. Scolding	7	11	1
10. Saying Child Has Disappointed Group	11	8	1
11. Frowning or Looks of Disapproval	2	14	3
12. Threatening to Withdraw Affection	14	5	0
13. Moralizing	8	6	5
14. Pointing Out Child As Bad Example	16	2	1

Analysis of the results would seem to indicate that "teacher approval" was the basis for most reinforcement while "peer group approval" was not used as frequently. This is borne out by items 7 and 8 on Table 24. Fifteen teachers were observed as never or occasionally were "Indicating Child Has Pleased Group." While "Giving Material Rewards" was obviously frowned upon, recent research on Reinforcement Therapy and Operant Conditioning makes such a technique worthy of exploration.

Results indicate that "Ignoring", "Moralizing" and "Frowning or Looks of Disapproval". were the methods most used by teachers to facilitate extinction of Socially Undesirable Behavior, while "Threatening to Withdraw Affection", "Calling on Outside Authority", and "Pointing out Child as Bad Example" were least frequently used.

Analysis of results in Table 25 and comparison with Table 24 indicates a similarity between findings, i.e., overt teacher disapproval is most favored to mediate or control undesirable behavior while peer group control is used much less.

It appears, thus, that teachers are hoping to develop socially acceptable behavior through a "modelling" process in which the teacher sees himself as representing the values and mores of society and transmits these values to the children as a "model" himself. While the interpretation of social "reality" to the children by the Operation Return staff may have long range benefits, a force, at least equally important for these children, is peer group expectations, values, and orientation. Peer-group membership is particularly valuable by children and represents an opportunity for the child to self-direct his behavior as he perceived its effect upon his peers. Teachers need to demonstrate greater awareness of group process and to make use of group techniques in the management of behavior.

Analysis of the Operation Return Coordinator Interview Form

All Operation Return Coordinators in participating districts were interviewed

by members of the NYU evaluation staff in order to ascertain information in the following areas:

I. Recruitment and Hiring of Operation Return Workers

II. Procedures and Problems with Selection of Instructional Sites

III. The Coordinator's Relationship to the Project

IV. Supervision and In-Service Training

V. Awareness of the Goals of Operation Return

VI. Recommendations of the Coordinators for the Improvement of Operation Return

Copies of this Interview Form were mailed to all Operation Return Coordinators prior to their interviews. All six coordinators were interviewed by the research team.

I. Recruitment and Hiring

There was little doubt that the recruitment and hiring problem was the major difficulty confronted by Operation Return Coordinators. The identification, interviewing and selection of teachers, educational assistants, family assistants, and psychologists proved to be extremely difficult. It was next to impossible to secure a pool of trained, experienced voluntary teachers called for in the project proposal who were interested in working with this population. In one district, however, as many as 23 teachers volunteered for consideration and were carefully screened by project staff and community personnel, while in other districts "arm twisting" tactics were necessary to secure teachers for the program. In addition, both district and city coordinating services were lacking.

It was the firm belief of all coordinators interviewed that they were not given adequate time for this project in view of the other responsibilities assigned to them in their district. Constant frustrations in obtaining adequate funds for use within the project was also reported to be another difficult problem faced by Operation Return Coordinators.

As not uncommon in such projects, it was extremely difficult to employ the

psychologists for which the project was proposed. One district operated without a psychologist, another district had the services of a psychologist one day a week, another two districts shared the services of a psychologist, while two districts employed social workers. The difficulty of a social worker fulfilling the goals and job responsibilities described in the proposal is certainly understandable. It is also evident, and discussed further in the section of this report concerned with teacher evaluation of the program, that the services of social workers were, on the average, seen as less useful to the project than would have been psychological services.

II. Problems in Site Selection

One of the innovative notions in the Operation Return proposal was the conjecture that suspended students could have viewed the school setting as one in which they experienced both frustration and failure. Ten of the 20 Operation Return classes were, therefore, housed outside of school buildings. These locations included a church, boys' club, a YMHA, housing project, and store front operation. In general the Coordinators concluded that the out-of-school housing tended to be more appropriate for junior high school and older youth, while public school settings might be more appropriate for elementary aged pupils.

The major problem in the out-of-school housing identified by Coordinators was the absence of supporting facilities, primarily gymnasiums. Those programs housed in boys' clubs with such facilities seemed on the whole to be more desirable by coordinators than those in store fronts and housing projects. The major advantage, claimed by the coordinators, with store fronts was that in such settings, pupils experienced a greater sense of "our own place and we can do with it as we will." The instructional setting problem is discussed further in the preceding section of this report identified as program evaluation.

III. The Coordinators Relationship to the Project

The Coordinators varied widely as to the degree to which they became involved with Operation Return. In some districts, the coordinator had a close,

intimate relationship with project staff, was frequently involved in in-service activities, orientation sessions, and frequently visited project settings. In other districts the coordinator served much more as an administrative liaison, being relatively uninvolved with the project itself. There was a wide variation in the amount of time assigned the Coordinator to work with Operation Return from district to district and to expect equally close involvement of all coordinators with a minimal amount of time available is somewhat unrealistic. A project of this type needs, however, district-wide coordination and leadership. Evidence for this argument could be found in the sense of isolation experienced by many Operation Return personnel, particularly, those housed in non-school settings.

IV. Supervision and In-Service Training

All Coordinators expressed the belief that they were not able to provide adequate in-service training and supervision to the Operation Return staff, a contention borne out with interviews of all Operation Return workers. Again, it should be strongly stated that Coordinators were not provided adequate time nor is there any reason to believe that the individuals selected as Coordinators should be expected to be specialists in the instruction of children suffering from a large number of academic and emotional disturbances. As it was pointed out in the teacher evaluation section of this report, the primary focus of the Operation Return program, as seen by the staff, appeared to center upon the social and emotional development of the children, while academic competencies received relatively less attention. It should also be noted that the coordinators for Operation Return come mostly from people whose primary specialties are in the area of school counseling and guidance, or school psychology, or school social work services. It is not difficult to understand why such coordinators would put a primary emphasis on these goals. The instruction of emotionally disturbed children in the academic areas require special knowledge and competencies. It is recommended, therefore, that resource personnel with such knowledge and competencies be provided for use by the

coordinators.

There is little doubt, however, that the in-service and supervisory services offered the Operation Return staff were inadequate.

V. Awareness of Project Goals

The District Coordinators, on the whole, seemed very aware of the project objectives, and in their selection of staff, of giving evidence of understanding both of objectives of the program and the type of personnel needed to implement such a program satisfactorily. In addition, the Coordinators were most enthusiastic about the presence of the program within their districts, saw a great need for such a program, and were highly enthusiastic about the program. It could be conjectured that when an individual is frequently in a position of dealing with students that were suspended, and there is no adequate placement for such a pupil, the presence of a program such as Operation Return can do a great deal to reduce the feelings of anxiety experienced by such administrative personnel. This is not a worthless goal. Coordinators, however, were similar to other Operation Return staff in not enough emphasis given family involvement as a major project goal.

VI. Recommendations for Improvement

In general the suggestions for improvement of Operation Return Coordinators has been remarkably consistent with those advanced by the total Operation Return staff. Coordinators saw the primary value of Operation Return as the placement of pupils under suspension in small instructional groups, close supportive services, and an instructional setting which could remediate this pupil's difficulties. On the other hand, they too saw the frustrations of budgetary restrictions, the absence of adequate materials, inadequate budget for pupil transportation, a lack of time to perform their duties, and the inability to provide the assistance and the consultative needs which the Operation Return staff presented.

Analysis of Pupil Opinionnaire

It is a well-known assumption in phenomenological psychology that an individual's behavior is best understood when viewed through his eyes. For this

reason, it was the decision of the Operation Return evaluation staff to collect pupil self-perceptions relative to the objectives of Operation Return with respect to four dimensions: attitudes toward self, peers, adults, and school in general, with the specified academic areas in particular. In addition, a question was included to examine an expressed concern of the Operation Return Coordinators – perhaps placement in Operation Return would be such an enjoyable experience that students desire to return to other schools, might be minimized and, indeed, such a return handicapped by the close personal attention students experienced in this program.

Table 26.
Pupil Opinionnaire
(Pupil Self-Rating)*

Question		Mean
Compared with the school I went to before coming here, I believe that;		
1.	The other kids like me	3.54
2.	I like the other kids	3.31
3.	I like my teacher	4.17
4.	My teacher likes me	4.13
5.	I like school in general	3.08
6.	I like reading	3.73
7.	I like arithmetic	4.21
8.	I like social studies	2.86
9.	I am learning	3.72
10.	I like myself	4.39
11.	I want to go back to my old school	3.21
12.	My parents think I am learning	3.82
13.	I get along with the other kids	3.56
14.	I get along with grownups	4.21
15.	Compared with other teachers, I have had, my teacher believes I can learn.	4.72

*1. A lot less.

2. Less.

3. About the same.

4. More.

5. A lot more.

In general, the conclusion one would be forced to draw from this questionnaire is that Operation Return was viewed very positively when pupil opinion is used as a criterion. The means reported in Table 26 range from a high of 4.72 for question 15 – the current teacher in Operation Return was believed to see the student capable of learning much more than previous teachers he's experienced – to a low of 2.86 for question 8 – I like social studies – which is somewhat inconsistent with the relatively positive ratings for both reading and arithmetic, items 6 and 7. As the academic focus in Operation Return was, however, to be primarily placed on those fundamental skills, perhaps this rating reflects the emphasis in the program as experienced by the pupils themselves. Mean ratings of over 4 or believing that the experience in this school is more than experienced in schools in the past include: liking the teacher; the teacher liking me; liking arithmetic; liking oneself; getting along with grownups; and the item mentioned before–the teacher confidence in the pupil–reflect, indeed, a high and positive evaluation of the experiences of pupils in Operation Return.

While no comparable data for normal pupils in public schools are available on this instrument, it is the opinion of the Director of the Operation Return Evaluation that such results as presented here, are likely to be, at worst, no lower than would be derived from a study of normal pupils and quite possibly somewhat higher than what expectations from such a comparative study would be. It must be kept in mind, however, that student self-reports of liking academic work are in no ways guarantees that such work is in fact being mastered. It is also likely, however, that a greater liking for a given area is quite likely to lead to higher achievement. The marked increase in liking teachers, liking oneself, and being perceived as able to accomplish academic work is much more likely to lead to greater academic proficiency than would the inverse of such self-perceptions; perceptions that, it is conjectured, would have been found had such self-estimates been made by Operation Return pupils prior to placement in this program, and certainly higher than would be the opinions of suspended pupils rather than being enrolled in the program

currently being evaluated. In summary, therefore, one can conclude from inspection of the data in Table 26, that, utilizing the self-perception of pupils in the Operation Return program, it is an effective program seen as somewhat more effective in self- and teacher perceptions, and somewhat less effective or less enjoyable in the area of social studies. The relatively low rating of 3.08 given to school in general may be due to the respondents confusing the concept school with their experiences in school in general rather than Operation Return in particular. This, however, is only conjecture and would have to be substantiated with individual interviews with the pupils which were not possible.

Analysis of Pupil Placement following Operation Return Placement During the 1968-69 School Year

The preceding data in this report has been compiled from interviews, observations and self-perception questionnaires. As was stated in the evaluation design, the primary objective for evaluating the success of Operation Return would be in terms of the objectives of the program, e.g., a return to normal school operation, within a five to ten day period. It should be stated at this point that there is no way of knowing how many of the pupils placed in Operation Return during the 1968-69 year, following suspension from school, would have returned to regular enrollment or other placements in the absence of this program. As pupils were not randomly assigned for Operation Return placements and records kept of those suspended, and not so placed, it is not possible to make any definitive conclusion about the impact of Operation Return with respect to this very important variable. The history of the school district, however, would indicate that a lack of continued instruction for such pupils such as served by Operation Return is what gave rise to the need for such a program. Placement data for all districts participating in the program are given in Table 27 which is found on page 80.

Table 27.
Pupil Enrollment and Placements
For Operation Return, 1968-1969

Placement	Districts						Total
	1	5	19	21	27	28	
Operation Return 1969-1970	1	3	47	0*	12	8	71
Returned (Regular Classes)	12	5	29	38	12	31	127
Placed in "600" Schools	1	1	0	9	5	0	16
CRMD	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Medical Suspension	0	0	0	5	4	0	9
Institutionalized	2	1	0	1	2	0	6
Private School	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Job Corps	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Working Papers	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Moved Out of District	1	0	2	5	0	0	8
Total Enrolled (1968-1969)	18	11	78	62	35	39	243

*Program not in operation for 1969–1970.

The most general statement one could make for these figures was that 52 percent of all pupils enrolled in Operation Return during the 1968-69 school year returned to regular class by September 1969. Twenty-nine percent of those pupils enrolled were continued in Operation Return programs for the 1969-70 school year, thus 8 out of 10 pupils placed in Operation Return were either returned successfully to regular school classes or are being continued in the Operation Return program while the remaining pupils are rather widely scattered in other types of placements.

It is not possible to state whether such returns to normal instruction were "successful," as no follow-up data are currently available on what happens to Operation Return pupils upon return to regular instruction. It should be noted that District 19 deviated in its organization plan from that outlined in the project proposal. In February of 1969 the Operation Return Coordinator for District 19 secured additional funding for that program from the State Department of Public Instruction. With this additional funding, an additional teacher plus two counselors were added to the program operating in that District. In addition, the organization of that program added one-pre-suspense placement, four Operation Return placements, and one pre-return placement. Students were thus placed in a transitional stage when either confronting suspense or confronting return to regular instruction. Of note is that this particular district had the fewest number of placements, other than regular class instruction. It is also worth noting, however, that this district retained the largest number of pupils for Operation Return programs for the 1968-69 year. This length of stay in Operation Return is a factor that will be commented upon more definitively in the summary and conclusions of this evaluation. Further, all of the participating districts, save one, retained the program in their district for the 1969-70 school year. This is further evidence to the belief participating districts had in the value of this program, that, when local districts were given direct control of available funds, all but one district is continued in Operation Return.

It is not possible in this evaluation to make any more specific statement beyond these rather general conclusions with respect to the impact of Operation Return on pupil return to instruction. Procedures for suspense vary from district to district, screening procedures utilized in placing pupils in Operation Return programs varied from district to district, and the criteria for return varied from district to district. The interaction of these variables and the absence of comparable control subjects from each of the participating districts makes further conclusions unwarranted. It is evident, however, from examining the figures in Table 27 that

some districts were considerably more cautious in returning pupils to regular instruction than were others. Follow-up data of the relative success of pupils on return in districts might throw some light on the utility of return policies utilized. No clear cut criteria were employed for returning pupils other than the generalized opinions of the individuals working with these pupils. Success and failure of returning pupils could be validated against the behavioral data implicitly utilized by Operation Return staff in making such recommendations to examine whether or not the appropriate behavioral criteria are, in fact, being employed. It is, therefore, recommended that the behavior of successful returning pupils be compared with the behavior of non-successful returning pupils in an effort to determine the kinds of behavior that need to be examined if this project were to continue. The presence or absence of some behaviors in successful pupils might also provide some valuable information for placement in Operation Return classes.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This report has described the implementation of Project Operation Return in the six districts in which the program was instituted. Data gathered from interviews with the district coordinators of Operation Return, teachers, educational assistants, family assistants, and self-reports from Operation Return pupils have been presented and discussed. Finally, data describing the 1969-70 placement of pupils in Operation Return in 1968-69 were presented.

The project has been satisfactorily implemented in terms of design called for in the project's proposal. The only part in which the project has fallen short of that described in the proposal was the failure to obtain the services of qualified psychologists, and the concommitment absence of such personnel or substitution of social workers in that position. The fact that only one full-time psychologist was involved in the project, while the other psychologist was utilized but one day per week, led to the decision of the Operation Return evaluation team not to attempt to present data from school psychologist perceptions of Operation Return.

Despite the fact that recruitment and hiring procedures were extremely haphazard, it appeared that this project was able to attract and employ teachers, educational assistants, and family assistants who were able to function for the most part at an acceptable level of effectiveness. The absence of in-service training and supervision for all participants in Operation Return was the most common of the voiced criticisms by personnel participating in this project. For the most part participants had had little formal training in working with emotionally disturbed or disruptive youngsters. For the most part participants expressed a strong desire for more assistance in this area.

Again, of major concern to Operation Return participants was the absence of adequate materials and budget for supplementary materials and transportation of pupils to effect the objectives of Operation Return. Materials available, for the most part, were inappropriate, out of date, or simply unavailable. As a consequence, many pupils were exposed to similar kinds of materials which had not been particularly effective in assisting their learning while enrolled in normal schools a d reflects the possibility that they may preclude an adequate learning experience prior to returning to their regular programs.

It would appear that all members of Operation Return had a firm grasp of two of the project's three major objectives. Personnel were aware of and acted upon the assumption that the function of Operation Return was to return pupils to normal school settings, largely through vehicles of small-group instruction and personal attention to social-emotional behaviors. There appeared to be relatively little awareness and concern for involving the family of Operation Return pupils in a closer relationship with the project.

One of the major innovative goals of Operation Return was its hope to return pupils to regular class instruction in a relatively short period of time, explicitly stated in the project proposal as a five to ten day period. Unanimously, Operation Return personnel stated that such a goal was impossible and not particularly desirable. With this statement, the evaluation staff would concur. It is also true, however, that the evaluation staff must ask the following questions; if placement in

Operation Return is to be for a lengthy period of time (the common length of stay estimated by Operation Return personnel ranged from a month and a half to over a year) does this project overlap to an extreme extent with other Board of Education programs, e.g., day schools for emotionally distrubed children, formally "600" schools," junior guidance classes, and CRMD programs? Consistent with this interpretation is the fact that currently one district is attempting to find a single building in which to house all Operation Return classes, thereby, in effect, creating a separate school. The question must be raised what functional difference would this program have when compared with the "600 school" approach.

It would appear from data collected from district offices at the end of the 1968-69 school year with respect to placement of Operation Return pupils that there was a wide difference within districts with respect to the purpose for which districts utilized Operation Return. In some districts Operation Return was seen as an initial holding station for pupils prior to their being placed in "600 schools" and other special programs, while other districts appeared not to use this program for that purpose. The practice of one district in initiating pre-suspense classrooms as well as a transitional return experience for pupils before placement in normal school situations would, in the opinion of the evaluation team, hold real merit, and it is highly recommended that the effects of such transitional placement be investigated with follow-up studies during the current year.

It would appear that Operation Return has had a positive effect upon pupils' self-perceptions as derived from the data in the pupil opinionnaire administered by members of the evaluation team. In general pupils report more positive-self-perceptions, perceptions of adults, school and others as related to their stay in Operation Return when making comparisons between Operation Return placement and their experiences in their former school. A caution must be voiced with respect to these data, however. The data were collected at the close of the school year, a period of time in which many pupils have more positive attitudes towards school experience than might be the case were the data collected earlier in the year. In addition, there is a tendency for most individuals to respond to most

questionnaires in a positive framework, the "acquiesent set" phenomena. Of particular interest to the evaluation team was the mean rating for pupils' desire to return to their prior school. (See Table 26, page 77.) This mean was among the lowest reported, giving some credence to the fact that Operation Return may be the "heaven setting" feared by some teachers interviewed for this evaluation. A figure of this magnitude however, is not so low, as to represent a real concern to members of the evaluation team. This datum would suggest, however, a valid reason for some concern with this factor.

One thing that must be kept in mind in examining the results of any experimental project is the potential that much of the variance in pupil behavior could be attributed to what is known as the "Hawthorne effect" or the phenomena that individuals frequently perform better when they perceive themselves as receiving special attention. There is nothing particularly immoral with the "Hawthorne effect," and if the improvement in performance is found to be a function of this phenomena, and if ways can be found to institute this effect, it should be done. The danger is in confusing the "Hawthorne effect" with the specific procedures employed in Operation Return. It is quite likely that much of the disruptive behavior exhibited by many Operation Return pupils is an attention-seeking mechanism. If positive reinforcement techniques can be utilized with such pupils, possibly the self-perceptions reported by pupils may be maintained and enhanced on return to regular school placement.

There was a division of opinion on the part of some members of the NYU evaluation team with respect to the strong focus on social-emotional aspects of pupil behavior contrasted with the lessened priority given to the learning of basic skills. Part of the team strongly contended that the focus as perceived by Operation Return teachers was appropriate in that until a student learns to function in the social-emotional area, he is not likely to be able to acquire academic skills. Other members of the evaluation team contended that competence, if derived from academic skills, might reduce the frustration and hostility expressed by Operation Return pupils, allowing more effective social behavior to emerge. To take a firm

position on either side of this issue would appear to be somewhat fruitless. While it is undoubtedly true that relatively few pupils are suspended from schools because of their inability to do academic work, it is also true that not experiencing academic competency is related to disruptive behavior. In view of the fact that relatively few Operation Return instructors had had special preparation or skill in preparation of academic experiences for emotionally disturbed or disruptive pupils, some priority should be given in in-service instruction to this important competency. It is further contended by the evaluation team that to expect the district coordinators to be specialists in this area as well as in the other responsibilities held by them is unsound, therefore expert consultants in the area of curriculum and materials for emotionally disturbed children be sought, and an instructional material center be developed to provide Operation Return personnel with the latest materials available in this area.

It is also strongly recommended that some efforts be made to give the program more substantial backing at the district level on both financial and emotional dimensions. Working with pupils of the nature placed in Operation Return is a severe emotional problem for staff. It would appear advisable that all Operation Return personnel have the opportunity for access to services by which they can deal with their own frustrations and anxieties as a function of working with hyperactive and acting-up young children. The extreme difficulty in obtaining petty cash reimbursements for transportation and materials which led to members of the Operation Return staff to finance much of these activities from their own pockets, to say nothing of complicated procedures required for reimbursement of petty cash expenditures should be alleviated to a great extent and preferably eliminated. Amounts of money involved are literally infinitestimal when compared with the effect on the morale of Operation Return workers.

One of the major innovative factors of the Operation Return Program was an effort to place instructional settings in out-of-public-school locations. While commendable and innovative an idea as it may be, it appears to have worked to a questionable extent in Operation Return. Criticisms of inadequate facilities, lack of communication with the schools, and other physical difficulties were reported more

frequently in the out-of-school placements than in public school placements. A good idea is not necessarily a good action unless the action meets the demand the idea implies. By that, simply finding someplace that is not a public school setting which is available, may not be the best solution to the problem. In some instances the hostility to the Operation Return placements, both in public school settings as well as in some of the non-public school settings could have been alleviated by more adequate pre-planning of site selection. In some instances, the non-public school setting made working arrangements and modification of the physical structure extremely difficult, while in other settings the relatively receptive attitude to Operation Return pupils made such modifications much more workable. It is recommended by the NYU evaluation staff that further consideration be given to out-of-school placement for Operation Return instructional settings, but much more pre-planning should be involved with a more financial and emotional commitment on the part of the planners. In one instance, an Operation Return classroom was removed from its initial setting because the district was unable to pay the rent. This change in structure was undoubtedly extremely upsetting for the staff and pupils in that particular setting, and, in the opinion of the evaluation staff, inexcusable.

One of the most commendable aspects of Operation Return was the effective working relationships developed between the teacher and para-professional in the Operation Return program. It would appear to the evaluation team that the educational assistant appeared to be more fully integrated into the program, and was more accepted by the teacher and pupil, than was the family assistant. This may be due in part to the greater degree of ambiguity in the family assistant's role compared to that of the educational assistant, and the fact that the educational assistant and the teacher tended to work much more closely together than was the case with the family assistant, thus relegating that individual to more clerical and non-pupil involved activities. It is clear, however, that the involvement of para-professionals was an important part of the Operation Return program. A continuation of the use of such para-professionals is strongly recommended. It is also contended, however, that the salaries paid para-professionals seem hardly

adequate for the responsible positions and their importance in the program. It appears that the program is capitalizing on the strong attraction for working with young people in a genuine social commitment rather than honestly paying these individuals for what they are doing. In some instances this will mean that many able people may be lost from such programs. In the opinion of the NYU evaluation staff, such loss would be tragic indeed.

Finally, there are some important facts that must be given a great deal of attention. Two-hundred and forty-three young people were placed in Operation Return during the 1968-69 school year. Without the presence of Operation Return, these children would have been cut off from contact with school and left to their own resources. By September of 1969, 127 pupils had been returned to normal classroom instruction. It is true, of course, that there is no way of telling from this evaluation what number of these pupils would have been returned to regular class instruction had Operation Return not been in existence. It is also true that information is not available at this time that would let it be known how many of those pupils returned to regular classroom instruction are still functioning adequately within those normal class settings. An additional 71 pupils are enrolled in Operation Return classes for the current academic year. These pupils, too, would not be receiving any form of instruction or attention to their personal and social development within the school structure were Operation Return not in effect. More and different kinds of data are necessary before Operation Return may be adequately evaluated.

First and of foremost priority would be a follow-up study of those pupils returned to normal classroom instruction with an estimate of their functioning at this point in time. Second, the degree of which Operation Return duplicates the other forms of instructional programs sponsored by the Board of Education is not known and cannot be ascertained from this evaluation. Operation Return is an expensive program. The average pupil cost would be in the neighborhood of $2200 per pupil. It is impossible to ascertain, however, what the cost of not having an Operation Return available would be. In addition, the strong emphasis on social

and emotional development as available in the Operation Return program, could well supplement the types of treatment that many of the Operation Return pupils are receiving simultaneously. There is little doubt that pupils who are suspended from public school and disappear from view may well, over the long run, be of significantly more expense to society that those students whose participation in Operation Return allowed them to make more productive use of their school age years. In the considered judgment of the evaluation team, if follow-up studies demonstrate that a significant portion of those who are returned to the noraml classroom instruction maintain themselves adequately within the normal public school system as compared with pupils suspended who do not receive this treatment, then this program should be continued even in the absence of federal funding.

Ideally, it is recommended that a controlled experimental study be conducted on this program and that the design for the program be developed prior to the initial selection of participants. In the absence of such experimental data, only the descriptive material as presented in this evaluation is available. The validity of such descriptions is, of course, open to question. The effort here is to provide information to the professionals concerned with the implementation and operation of Operation Return. If this material can be helpful to these individuals as they plan further, then this evaluation will have served its purpose. If not, then this is simply another exercise in educational futility.

2. On the basis of your participation in this project, what would you judge to be the project's:

   a) Strengths

   b) Weaknesses:

3. Will you take this job again next year?

   a) Why?

Appendix B

Educational Assistant Interview Form

Appendix A

Teacher Interview Form

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

OPERATION RETURN EVALUATION

Name: _____ Title: Teacher

District: _____ Date of Interview: _____

Location of Class: _____

I. Recruiting and Hiring

1. Date you began work in the project.

2. What factors influenced you to join Operation Return?

3. What procedures were followed in recruiting and hiring you?

4. Do you feel that these procedures were effective in selecting the kind of staff necessary to perform your role?

   a) Why?

   b) Other suggestions for recruitment?

II. Educational Background and Prior Work Experience.

1. Indicate level of schooling completed (e.g., college graduate, B. A. + 15 credits, Master's Degree, etc.).

2. Have you had any academic preparation or coursework, prior to joining Operation Return, which prepared you for your role in this project?

   a) If so, what courses?

b) Where taken?

c) When taken?

3. Before joining Operation Return, had you worked with emotionally disturbed children in any way?

a) If so, in what capacity?

b) What were your responsibilities?

c) Where was this?

d) When was this?

4. Did you have any teaching experience prior to joining Operation Return?
a) If so –

Where	Title	Activities (e.g. ages grades, subjs)	When

5. Do you feel that the combination of academic coursework and experience which you have had is adequate to prepare you for teaching in Operation Return?

   a) Why?

   b) Will you be studying further in the field of education for emotionally disturbed children? Where? When?

III. Program Information.

1. Age range of your class?

2. Number of children enrolled in your class?

3. Average daily attendance:

4. Generally, how would you describe the pupils with whom you work?
   a) Description of pupils' problems:

   b) Level of pupils' academic functioning:

5. In defining your job, what do you feel are your responsibilities in this class? (In order of importance)

   a) No. 1 _____

   b) No. 2 _____

   c) No. 3 _____

   d) No. 4 _____

   e) Other (specify) _____

6. What have been your major satisfactions about the program?

7. What have been your major discouragements about the program?

8. What have been your major successes in the program?

9. What have been your major failures in the program?

10. How many of your children, do you think, will . . . .

    a) return to regular public school classes _____

    b) require lengthy special class placement _____

    c) need institutional care, e.g. mental hospital _____

11. How many of your children will, after a year in this program, make –

	Personal Adjustment	Academic Adjustment
Satisfactory		
Marginal		
Unsatisfactory		

12. How much time, during a typical week, does your class spend on . . (percentages, please)

    a) Academics (Total) _____

    b) Reading _____

    Math _____

    Social Studies _____

    Science _____

    Others (Specify) _____

    c) Art _____

    Music _____

    d) Shop Work _____

    e) Recreation/Gym _____

    Quiet Games _____
    "Free Play" _____
    Others (Specify) _____

    f) Individual or Group Discussions about Behavior _____

13. In addition to classroom responsibilities, how is your time spent in Operation Return?

    a) Contact with sending school _____

    b) contact with social agencies _____

    c) work with children's families _____

    d) Consultation with other Operation Return workers, e.g. Psychologist _____

    Educational Asst. _____

    Family Asst. _____

    Supervisor _____

    e) Others (Specify) _____

14. Are appropriate instructional materials available to you as needed and in sufficient quantity?

    a) If not, what would you need that you don't have?

15. Have you made your own materials?

    a) Which materials? _____ For what purpose?

    1. 1.

    2. 2.

    3. 3.

16. How do you feel about your having your classroom in a _____?
Advantages? Disadvantages?

17. Teaching Methodology
a) What particular teaching techniques have you found effective with your class?

b) What methods do you use to motivate your class towards learning?

c) How do you "group" children for instruction?

d) How do you evaluate pupil growth in learning?

e) How are "rewards" used in your class and what kinds of rewards are usually given?

18. Have funds been made available to you for purchasing necessary items?

    a) How much?

    b) For what have these funds been used?

IV. Classroom Climate and Control.

1. How do you establish rules and limits?

2. In which areas of behavior do rules and limits exist for your class?Enumerate several of the rules. Why were they developed?

3. How do children respond to these rules and limits?

4. What methods do you use to maintain rules and limits?

5. How do you discipline children when rules are broken or limits exceeded?

6. Who can you turn to for help with negative behavior?

   a) Is he helpful? How?

V. Relationship to Professional Staff.
   1. In what ways do you relate to the Educational Assistant?

      a) What changes would you make in his role?

   2. In what ways do you relate to the Family Assistant?

      a) What changes would you make in his role?

3. In what ways do you relate to the Psychologist?

   a) What changes would you make in his role?

4. In what ways do you relate to the District Coordinator?

   a) What changes would you make in his role?

5. Do you relate to any other members of the Operation Return Staff? Who?

   a) In what ways do you relate to him?

   b) What changes would you make in his role?

VI. Supervision and In-Service Training.

1. Who supervises your work?

2. How are you supervised?

3. Is supervision helpful to you?

   a) In what way?

4. How would you improve supervision?

5. Have you had any orientation sessions?

   a) How many?

   b) What happened at these sessions?

   c) Were they helpful?

      Why?

d) What changes would you make?

6. Have you had any in-service training?

a) How was this done? Who was present? Where was it held?

b) How helpful was this training?

c) What change would you like to make in this in-service training?

VII. Goals of the Project.

1. On the basis of your participation in this project, what do you see is the purpose(s) of Operation Return?

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

OPERATION RETURN EVALUATION

Name: _____ Title: Educational Assistant

District: _____ Date of Interview: _____

I. Recruiting and Hiring

1. Date you began in the project?

2. What factors influenced you to join Operation Return?

3. What procedures were followed in recruiting and hiring you?

4. Which procedures do you feel are effective in attracting and selecting staff necessary to perform your role?

5. Other suggestions for recruitment?

II. Educational Background and Prior Work Experience.

1. Indicate level of schooling completed (e.g., some high school, high school graduate, some college, etc.).

2. Have you had any academic preparation or course work, prior to joining Operation Return, which prepared you for your role in this project?

   a) If so, what courses?

   b) Where taken?

   c) When taken?

3. Before joining Operation Return, had you worked with emotionally disturbed children in any way?

   a) If so, in what capacity?

   b) What were your responsibilities?

   c) Where was this?

   d) When was this?

4. Did you have any experience related to education prior to joining Operation Retturn?

   a) If so,

Where	Title	Activities

III. Program Information

1. Age range of your class?

2. Number of children enrolled in your class?

3. Average Daily Attendance:

4. Generally, how would you describe the pupils with whom you work? Descriptions of pupils'

   a) Problems

   b) Level of pupils' academic functioning

IV. Role in the Project

1. What activities do you engage in as part of your work? _____

   a) Assisting teachers in record keeping? _____

   b) Escorting pupils in and out of the building? _____

   c) Supervising the lunch period? _____

   d) Others, (please specify) _____

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

   _____ _____

2. In your opinion, which of your activities is of most benefit to the program?

   a) How does it benefit program?

   b) Why do you feel it is of most benefit?

3. Which of your activities is of least benefit to the program?

   a) How is it not beneficial?

   b) Why do you feel it is of least benefit?

Which of your activities should others be doing?

a) Who should be doing it?

b) Why should they be doing it?

5. What is your professional relationship to the teacher?
   A. Do you have formal meetings? Plan together? Discuss children, etc.?

   a) How often?

   b) What happens at these meetings?

   B. Any suggestions for improving the nature of the professional relationship to the teacher?

6. Do you relate to any other members of the Operation Return Staff?

   a) Who?

   b) What is the nature of the relationship?

   c) Would you change it in any way?

7. Ideally, if you could develop your role in any way you felt necessary, what changes would you make?

   a) Why?

V. Supervision and In-Service Training.

1. Who supervises your work?

2. How are you supervised?

3. Is supervision helpful to you?

   a) in what way?

4. How would you improve supervision?

5. Have you had any orientation sessions?

   a) How many?

   b) What happened at these sessions?

   c) Were they helpful?

      Why?

   d) What changes would you make?

6. Have you had any in-service training?

   a) How was this done? Who was present? Where was it held?

b) How helpful was this training?

c) What change would you like to make in this in -service training?

VI. Goals of the Project;

1. On the basis of your participation in this project, what do you see is the purpose(s) of Operation Return?

2. On the basis of your participation in this project, what would you judge to be the project's:

   a) Strengths

   b) Weaknesses:

3. Will you take this job again next year?

   a) Why?

Appendix C

Family Assistant Interview Form

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

OPERATION RETURN EVALUATION

Name: _____ District: _____ Title: Family Asst.

Date you began work in this project: _____

1. What were you doing before you took this job?

2. How did you first hear about this project?

3. How were you hired?

4. Why were you interested in this job?

5. Who were the persons who interviewed and hired you?

6. What qualifications do you think the interviewers were looking for?

7. How many hours per day do you serve on the average?

8. How do you use project time? (Use rough percentages which should total 100%.)

	Expected of you:	What you do:	What you would do:
Assisting teachers in record keeping	_____	_____	_____
Escorting pupils in and out of the building	_____	_____	_____
Supervising lunch period	_____	_____	_____
Doing home visits	_____	_____	_____
a. during day _____			
b. during evening _____			
weekends _____			
Attending meetings with groups of parents	_____	_____	_____
Attending in-service meetings	_____	_____	_____
Other activities–specify	_____	_____	_____

9. a. When a teacher communicates with parents, are you informed or involved?

   b. How is it working out?

   c. If you believe improvements could be made, what suggestions would you make?

   d. Does teacher utilize your recommendations? How? What is relationship with teacher?

   e. What is relationship with teacher assistant?

10. Does anyone supervise your work?

    a. Who?

    b. How often?

    c. How do you report to your supervisor?

    d. What happens in the supervision?

    e. Is your supervision helpful to you?

11. How many in-service training meetings have you had with the Project Supervisory Coordinator?

    a. Where were they held?

    b. What was the main topic of discussion?

    c. Who was present?

    d. Who helpful were the meetings?

12. How many in-service training sessions have you had with the Project Social Worker?

    a. Where were they held?

    b. What was the main topic of discussion?

    c. Who was present?

    d. How helpful were the meetings?

13. How many orientation sessions have you had?

    a. Where were they held?

    b. What was the main topic of discussion?

    c. Who was present?

    d. How helpful were the meetings?

14. a. Do you call for pupils who fail to attend instruction? If so, how often?

    b. Who asks you to do this?

    c. Is this a necessary part of your job?

15. Are there other students who you escort to and from school?

    a. If so, how often?

    b. Who asks you to do this?

    c. What do you think about it?

16. What do you see as your relationship with the home of the students in the Project?

17. a. What other activities do you do?

    b. Are there other activities that you don't do that you think you should?

17. c. What other activities do you do that someone else should do?

d. What other activities do you do that you think needn't be done?

18. a. What age pupils do you work with?

b. Generally, how would you describe them?

c. How would you describe their problems?

19. On the basis of your participation in this project, what do you see as the purpose(s) of this Project?

20. On the basis of your participation in this Project, what would you judge to be the Project's

Strengths	Weaknesses

Appendix D

Program Assessment and Classroom Observation Form

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

OPERATION RETURN EVALUATION

Program Assessment

Location: _____ Date: _____

Teacher: _____ Observer: _____

Age Range of the Children: _____

Number Present: _____

Ethnic Breakdown of Children Present: _____

_____

	Inadequate	Marginal	Satisfactory
I. Physical Structure			
Room Size			
Ventilation			
Storage Space			
Seating			
Accessibility to Room			
Freedom from safety hazards			
Others (Specify)			

COMMENTS: Physical Conditions.

a) How appropriate is the setting for the classroom?

II. Room Arrangement

1. How does teacher use the room to facilitate learning activities?

2. Considering the physical conditions under which the teacher must work, rate the suitability of the room arrangement.

   Most Unsuitable 1 2 3 4 5 Highly Suitable

3. Consider the flexibility with which the teacher adapts the room for various purposes, e.g. lecture, experimentation, etc.

   Inflexible 1 2 3 4 5 High Flexible

III. Educational Assistant

1. Was the educational assistant present throughout the day?

2. What responsibilities did the educational assistant have in the program?

3. Rate the general effectiveness of the educational assistant in fulfilling his responsibilities.

   Totally Ineffective 1 2 3 4 5 Highly Effective

4. Why do you give this rating?

5. Were any other adults present during the day?

   a) Who?

   b) Explain function.

IV. Equipment

1. What materials or equipment (teacher-made or otherwise) were used or were present in the room during your time of observation for ——

	Used	Present but not used
a) Reading or Language Arts		
b) Science		
c) Mathematics		
d) Social Studies		
e) Art or Music		

	Used	Present but not used
f) Games		
g) Gym		
h) Shop		
i) Others (Specify)		

V. Curriculum Experiences

1. Indicate the nature of any learning experiences and the interaction between pupils, pupil and teacher, etc. which you observed in . . . .

   a) Language Arts (Reading, Spelling, Writing, Speaking)

   b) Science

c) Social Studies

d) Mathematics

e) Art or Music

f) Gym

g) Shop

h) Others (Specify)

2. With reference to your observations, rate the academic aspect of the program –

Non-existent 1 2 3 4 5 Highly Emphasized

a) Why did you give this rating?

3. Repeat rating for the aesthetic or creative aspects of the program –

Non-existent 1 2 3 4 5 Highly Emphasized

a) Why did you give this rating?

4. Repeat rating for recreational aspects of the program

Non-existent 1 2 3 4 5 Highly Emphasized

a) Why did you give this rating?

5. Summary Rating –
How effective is this teacher in promoting the intellectual development of the children?

Not very effective 1 2 3 4 5 Very effective

VI. Social-Emotional Aspects.

1. How did the teacher stimulate the growth of positive human relationships?

a) Rate the degree to which the teacher effects the above

Low degree 1 2 3 4 5 High Degree

VII. Relationship with Team

1. With which team members did the teacher have contact during your observation?

a) What was the nature of the relationship to each, e.g., Educational Assistant, Psychologist, etc.?

b) To what extent did the teacher and the educational assistant work together as a team?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Smoothly functioning

c) Please repeat above rating for any other team members with whom the teacher had contact.

VIII. Relationship with Parents

1. Did teacher have any interaction with parents during your observation?

a) If so, what was the nature of the interaction?

2. How did the teacher help the children understand their own motives and those of other people?

   a) Rate the degree to which the teacher effects the above

   Low degree 1 2 3 4 5 High degree

3. How does the teacher promote children's self esteem?

   a) Rate the degree to which the teacher effects the above

   Low degree 1 2 3 4 5 High degree

4. How does the teacher help the children to channel their feelings in appropriate ways?

   a) Rate the degree to which the teacher effects the above

   Low degree 1 2 3 4 5 High degree

5. Summary Rating –
   How effective is this teacher in promoting the social-emotional development of the children?

   Not very effective 1 2 3 4 5 Very effective

6. Summary Rating –
   Check which of the following appears to be the main focus of this program:

   _____ Intellectual Development

   _____ Social-Emotional Development

   _____ Motor Development

   _____ No focus apparent

IX. Relationship with Children.
Consider the following methods of positive and negative reinforcement and indicate the relative frequency of teacher's use –

1. Negative Reinforcement

	No Use	Occasional	Frequent
Physical Restraint			
Removing from the group			
Calling on outside authority			
Uses words of shame			
Ignoring			
Depriving of objects			
Depriving of privilege			
Threats			
Scolding			
Saying child has disappointed group			
Frowning or looks of disapproval			
Threatening to withdraw affection			
Moralizing			
Pointing our child as bad example			
Other (Specify)			

a) What is the teacher's main method of negative reinforcement?

2. Positive Reinforcement

	No Use	Occasional	Frequent
Praises			
Smiles or Nods			
Pointing our child as good example			
Patting, or other physical contact			
Granting special privileges			
Giving material rewards			
Saying child has pleased teacher			
Indicating child has pleased group			

a) What's the teacher's main method of positive reinforcement?

3. To what extent is the teacher able to get children to participate in the academic aspects of the classroom?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

4. To what extent does the teacher build upon the pupil's previous experience?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

5. To what extent does the teacher maintain and develop rapport?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

6. To what extent does the teacher provide opportunity for expression of individual thought?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

7. To what extent does the teacher use classroom routines advantageously?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

8. To what extent does the teacher provide for individual differences?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

9 To what extent does the teacher show evidence of favoritism?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

10. To what extent does the teacher encourage free interaction?

None 1 2 3 4 5 Very much

a) How?

Appendix E

Operation Return Coordinator Interview Form

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

OPERATION RETURN EVALUATION

Name: _____ District: _____ Title: _____

Date project became operational in your District: _____

PLEASE FILL OUT ALL INFORMATION CALLED FOR IN THE FIRST FOUR QUESTIONS BEFORE YOU ARE SEEN BY A MEMBER OF THE RESEARCH TEAM.

1. Please list the location, instructional level and personnel by name and position for each Operation Return Instructional Center in your district. List number of students currently on register at each instructional center.

   A. Center Address: _____

   _____ Phone: _____

   Teacher's Name: _____ Instructional Level: _____

   Teacher Aide: _____

   Enrollment on Register: _____

   Average Daily Attendance: _____

   B. Center Address: _____

   Teacher's Name: _____ Instructional Level: _____

   Teacher Aide: _____

   Enrollment on Register: _____

   Average Daily Attendance:

   C. Family Assistant's Name: _____

   Address: _____

   _____ Phone: _____

D. Center Address: _____

_____ Phone: _____

Teacher's Name: _____ Instructional Level: _____

Teacher Aide: _____

Enrollment on Register: _____

Average Daily Attendance: _____

E. Center Address: _____

_____ Phone: _____

Teacher's Name: _____ Instructional Level: _____

Teacher Aide: _____

Enrollment on Register: _____

Average Daily Attendance: _____

F. Family Assistant's Name: _____

Address: _____

_____ Phone: _____

G. School Psychologist's Name: _____

Address: _____

_____ Phone: _____

2. How many pupils were suspended per month during the 1967-1968 school year?

Month: _____ 9 _____ 10 _____ 11 _____ 12 _____ 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ 5 _____ 6 _____

Grades 4-6

Principal

Supt.

Grades 7-9

Principal

Supt.

High School

Principal

Supt.

3. a. Number returned and currently attending regular classes.

   b. 'umber returned to regular classes, suspended again and returned to Operation Return.

   c. N nber returned to regular classes, suspended again and not in Operation Return.

   d. Num er left Operation Return and did not return to regular classes.

   e. Where are those pupils in (d) above?

4. Of those pupils currently participating in Operation Return, how many were participating in the project during the 1967-1968 school year?

5. What procedures were followed in the selection of instructional centers?

   a. Criteria

   b. Personnel involved in selection

6. Ideally where do you believe such centers should be located?

   Why:

7. Why were you selected as District Coordinator for this project?

8. What percentage of your time is given to this project?

9. How do you use project time? (Use rough percentages which should total 100 percent.)

10. According to the project proposal, teachers were to be volunteers, experienced and trained.

    a. What procedures were followed in recruiting volunteers?

    b. How many volunteered?

    c. What procedures were followed in selection?

    d. What was the prior experience that qualified them for selection?

    e. What is or was the nature of their training for this project?

    f. Problems in staffing re teachers.

11. a. What procedures were followed in recruiting teacher aides?

b. What procedures were followed in selection?

c. What is or was the nature of their training for this project?

d. Problems in staffing re teacher aides.

12. a. What procedures were followed in recruiting the family aides?

b. What procedures were followed in selection?

c. What is or was the nature of their training for this project?

d. Problems in staffing re family aides.

13. a. What procedures were followed in recruiting school psychologists for this project?

13. b. What procedures were followed in selection?

c. What is or was the nature of their training for this project?

d. Problems in staffing re school psychologists.

14. What specific procedures were followed for suspension by –

a. Principal

(1) Grades 4-6

(2) Grades 7-9

(3) High School

14. b. Superintendent

(1) Grades 4-6

(2) Grades 7-9

(3) High School

15. What procedures are employed for the selection of pupils to participate in Operation Return?

(a) Grades 4-6

(b) Grades 7-9

(c) High School

16. How long, on the average, do pupils remain in the project?

    (a) Minimum

    (b) Average

    (c) Maximum

17. What might account for any differences in the pupils' retention in the project?

18. On what criteria are pupils to be returned to regular classes?

19. What procedures are followed in returning a pupil to regular classes?

20. Where are pupils who participated in the project during the 1967-1968 school year and who are not now enrolled in Operation Return?

21. Where are the pupils who were suspended this year that are not participating in the project?

22. For those suspended and subsequently placed in other Board of Education projects, what was the basis of those placements?

23. On the basis of your participation in this project, what do you see as the purpose(s) of this project?

24. On the basis of your participation in this project, what would you judge to be the project's

(a) Strengths

(b) Weaknesses

Appendix F

Pupil Opionnaire

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
CENTER FOR FIELD RESEARCH

OPERATION RETURN EVALUATION

Please circle the words that say how you feel.

Compared with the school I went to before coming here, I believe that:

1. The other kids like me

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

2. I like the other kids

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

3. I like my teacher

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

4. My teacher likes me

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

5. I like school in general

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

6. I like reading

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

7. I like arithmetic

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

8. I like social studies

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

9. I am learning

   a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

10. I like myself

a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

11. I want to go back to my old school

a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

12. My parents think I am learning

a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

13. I get along with the other kids

a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

14. I get along with grown-ups

a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

15. Compared with other teachers I have had, my teacher believes I can learn

a lot less – less – about the same – more – a lot more

The thing I like best about school now is . . .